DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 203 SO 014 156

AUTHOR Reardon, Betty
TITLE Militarization, Security, and Peace Education: A Guide for Concerned Citizens.
INSTITUTION United Ministries in Education, Valley Forge, Pa.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 96p.; Not available in paper copy due to some pages with print on a dark gray background. Some pages may not reproduce clearly in microfiche.
AVAILABLE FROM United Ministries in Education, c/o Educational Ministries-ABC, Valley Forge, PA 19481 ($4.50 for book, $8.50 for Supplementary Learning Packet, $12.00 for set).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizen Participation; *Community Action; Disarmament; Global Approach; International Relations; National Defense; *Peace; Program Guides; *Public Affairs Education; World Affairs

ABSTRACT

This guide provides a general introduction to the field of peace education, especially the problems of peace and security. Two purposes are to provide a deeper knowledge of the issues and to provide materials, documentation, and information about additional resources and organizations to aid in implementing a peace education program in the community. The guide is organized into an introduction, four study sessions, and one action-planning session. The introduction includes guidelines for organizing and conducting a study/action group. Information provided for each of the four study sessions includes a description of objectives and content to be covered in the session, a brief background reading and dilemmas, recommended readings, and questions to stimulate review, discussion, and action. Topics of the sessions are: Human Security: The Basis of a Peace System; National Security: The Dilemmas of the War System; Peace Education; Tools for Global Community Buildup; and The Goals of Peace Education: Learning Objectives. After reading about and discussing these various topics, citizens in the final session of the program are expected to develop action responses to deal with the conditions discovered. Actions particularly necessary are those which will educate our society in ways of assuring community, national, and global security. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MILITARIZATION, SECURITY, AND PEACE EDUCATION

A GUIDE FOR CONCERNED CITIZENS

ED218203

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Kelly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Written by Betty Reardon
for
The United Ministries in Education
Peacemaking, Militarism, and Education Program

United Ministries in Education, Publisher

Valley Forge, Pa.

SP 014 156

Quotations from Robert C. Johansen in *Toward a Dependable Peace: A Proposal for an Appropriate Security System* are used with his permission. (World Order Models Project Working Paper #8, published by the Institute for World Order, New York, 1978.)

Quotations from Ernie Regehr in *Militarism and the World Military Order. A Study Guide for Churches* are used with permission from the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches.

Quotations from *peaceworld* are used with permission from Friendship Press, New York.

United Ministries in Education
c/o Educqtional Ministries-ABC
Valley Forge, PA 19481

Study Guide $4.50
Supplementary Learning Packet $8.50
Guide and Packet Set $12.00

Cover design: Jerry Fargo

MILITARIZATION, SECURITY, AND PEACE EDUCATION: A Guide for Concerned Citizens. Published by United Ministries in Education, c/o Educational Ministries—ABC, Valley Forge, PA 19481. April, 1982.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 82-050199

Contents

	Page
SESSION ONE—Introduction	1
SESSION TWO—Human Security: The Basis of a Peace System	13
SESSION THREE—National Security: The Dilemmas of the War System	26
SESSION FOUR—Peace Education: Tools for Global Community Building	37
SESSION FIVE—The Goals of Peace Education: Learning Objectives	53
SESSION SIX—Starting a Peace Education Program	76
APPENDIX	88

SESSION 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROGRAM

Purposes of the Study/Action Program

This booklet is designed to guide exploration of the role of education in the "achievement of a demilitarized world." We use this phrase rather than "education for peace and justice" for several reasons.

First, those involved in United Ministries in Education's (UME) Peacemaking, Militarism, and Education Program share the assumption that our present world order is highly militarized. Support for this assumption is found in such trends as the inordinate growth of military and weapons expenditures, the expanding arms trade, the proliferation of and increased capacity for overkill and precise targeting of weapons of mass destruction. Witness also the numerous military governments replacing civilian rule throughout the world, and the superordinate role military values are playing in so many diverse societies.

Militarism has been described by the World Council of Churches as being

> . . . the result of a process whereby military values, ideology and patterns of behavior achieve a dominating influence over the political, social, economic and foreign affairs of the state. Under militarism all of society's objectives, not only the traditionally limited objectives of military preparedness, are made the purview of military institutions, methods, and values. The result, in addition to the misuse of resources and talents, is a diminished national security. (Ernst Regehr, *Militarism and the World Military Order*, World Council of Churches, 1980, p. 33)

Values are fundamental factors affecting all public issues, reflecting the basic beliefs of the society, and guiding choices for the future. The issue of values is a deep concern for Christians. It places the problem of mili-

tarization squarely in the educational context since education is largely a process of the formulation and transfer of values. Christian education is concerned with the process as it engenders Christian beliefs and a Christian life. Public education is concerned with the process as it affects social values and the public order. As Christians, and as citizens with a social dedication to human betterment, we are committed to educate for a peaceful and just social order. Therefore, we assert that values consistent with peace and justice should be nurtured by public education.

Second, this assertion relates to another reason for stating the purpose of this educational endeavor as "the achievement of a demilitarized world." We hold that values are not merely abstract concepts of the good and the true. They are also standards and criteria of concrete goals toward which we struggle. Peace and justice are not ideals to be cherished but realities to be achieved. Achieving a new or preferred reality requires an undoing of the present reality by understanding its true nature and learning to transcend the obstacles to the preferred reality. Of major importance for this program is the study of the present reality of the militarized world as it is delineated by the trends cited in the paragraph above. Understanding the nature and consequences of the trends toward world militarization should be one of the first objectives of education for peace.

Third, the focus in this guide is on militarization and the arms race because these phenomena constitute the most real and urgent threat to the welfare and survival of the entire human family. Objectives dealing with militarization and the arms race are seen as fundamental and requisite to more general objectives of peace education.

Fourth, another factor which leads us to emphasize militarization is its influence on other world problems such as development and human rights, and its relationship to the fundamental nature of our historic period. This era is vastly different from all other periods of human history. The world is undergoing changes equal in dimension to those of the industrial revolution and perhaps as great as those changes brought about by the emergence of agriculture and human settlements.

Our world is rapidly changing and full of conflict. Militarization is the primary response of most contemporary societies seeking security in the midst of this conflict and change. What is becoming clear to a growing minority, among them people in many Christian denominations, is that militarization is a defensive and regressive response to conditions which cry out for the most creative and progressive responses possible. A review and analysis of this military response is required so that practical alternatives to militarization can be formulated. Without some concrete visions of a demilitarized world we cannot plan specific actions for achieving the designated goal of a world of peace and justice. Capacity to engage in such an analysis and to plan practical strategies for action are essential objec-

tives of peace education. Developing these capacities among our citizens is essential to the achievement of true security.

Finally, we speak of militarization because it connotes a process, not a static condition. It constitutes a trend of rapidly accumulating developments carrying us ever farther away from a peaceful, just, and secure world and closer to destruction and holocaust. The militarization process invests more and more social, economic, and political responsibilities in military institutions and places a higher priority on military values over all others. The process is the more dangerous because it results from decisions made by only a few members of the entire human family. The vast majority of people on earth have no voice in that decision-making. Most are not aware of the actual dimensions and consequences of such decisions.

Even peace activists have not taken sufficient note of this trend. While the peace movement has been active for years, only recently has it begun to focus on the issues of arms and militarization as central concerns, and to comprehend the pervasive and destructive consequences of building a war machine as a means to preserve the peace. People in the peace movement have concentrated on specific and particular causes and issues such as the Vietnam war, the development of the MX missile, or the neutron bomb. Few among those engaging in the debates, whether they opposed or favored the policies, took into consideration the total, global process within which these developments took place. Very few analyzed the underlying values. Such an analysis could have provided a conscious understanding of what was happening to the democratic principles which place civil authority above the military, and to the political tradition which espouses the achievement of the common welfare as the major purpose of government. The process went on largely unnoticed by both the general public and much of the peace movement.

In most cases it was after the fact that values encouraged by militarization were affirmed and militarism acknowledged as a legitimate value system necessary to assure public order and to defend the nation. Military takeovers were rationalized as necessary for "development" in various countries. While the industrial nations, such as the U.S., tolerated or perhaps even encouraged these takeovers, militarization has had less visible impact on their own institutions and daily life. Many thoughtful people fear that the military impact on the representative democracies has been profound and irreversible. Others still believe it is possible to reverse the trend. No overt commitment to the values of militarism has been publicly stated. The military is still generally perceived as the instrument of civil authority. Yet indications of the trend toward militarization grow steadily more evident, most especially in the rapid acceleration of the arms race.

Education and action are needed to develop awareness of the process of militarization and its consequences, and to encourage the analysis of the implicit and explicit values of the process. Otherwise, our "representative democracies" can also slip into full-scale militarism, negating our most revered democratic institutions and violating our most deeply held Christian values. (*Note:* People interested in this issue may want to read "Militarism and Sexism: Influences on Education for War," *UME Connexion*, Fall, 1981. See Additional Resources in the appendix for address.)

This guide is intended to help build awareness, to encourage analysis, and to initiate action to reverse the process of militarization.

Survey of Opinions and Perception of the Effects of Military Preparedness on Education

The Peacemaking, Militarism, and Education Program conducted a survey among educators and citizens to gain insights into current perceptions of the growth of militarism in our society and the relationship of national security issues to our public education system. Three of the conclusions derived from that survey are especially relevant to this study/action program. (*Note:* A report of the conclusions is available from United Ministries in Education – see Additional Resources in appendix.)

First, *awareness of the scope, severity, and complexity of the current process of world militarization is very limited.* Even among those respondents who perceived significant elements of militarism in our own society, little concern was expressed about the global process of militarization. No specific question was asked about that process, but references were made to the changes in the role of the military and emphasis on military preparedness which would have allowed for such observation. A large number deplored the waste of resources and the dangers of war inherent in the arms race. Some observed the denial of human rights and the growth of political repression aggravated by arms trade. However, few noted the potential shift of political evolution from ever-widening democratization to growing authoritarianism impelled by the requirements of "national security." (*Note:* These trends are analyzed by Richard Falk in *A World Perspective on Authoritarian Tendencies*. See Recommended Readings in appendix.)

Second, *citizens and educators have little conceptual clarity or common understanding about what constitutes either militarism or militarization.* Those surveyed included a variety of educators, a group of people who identified themselves as peace educators, and citizens who are members of the Church of the Brethren. Considering the nature of the population surveyed, it is possible that the general citizenry has even less conceptual clarity and less awareness of the problems. The World Council of Churches acknowledged this fact in producing *Militarism and the World Military Order* as a general introduction to these concepts and problems.

Third, *respondents generally focused on opposing viewpoints about the efficiency and effects of primarily military responses to security needs.* Opinion on the need for growing military capacity ranged from those who advocated additional increases in armed strength to those who wanted to dismantle the military machine completely. Most advocated these differing policies as a means of protecting the same fundamental values, best described as the values of freedom and equality. Even those who saw the military as the repository of many positive national values did not advocate armed strength for its own sake. While there was great disparity of opinion regarding the specific policies which comprise the militarization trend, respondents generally rejected outright militarism understood as authoritarian rule or the primacy of military over civil authority. At the conscious level, at least, these people still see civil authority as more favorable to the values of freedom and equality than military authority.

With more conceptual clarity about the issues, we might achieve more common agreement and construct a sounder basis for resolving differences. The major differences appear to be over what methods will make us more secure. We need, therefore, to clarify not only what comprises militarism and militarization, but also what constitutes security. Then all citizens may be able to collaborate on arriving at the most effective methods to achieve security. Much of this study/action program is devoted to such clarification of concepts and values, and to the initiation of an educational process more likely to contribute to true security.

How the Guide is Organized

This study guide is planned to provide three levels of study and action:

LEVEL I: Only this guide is used. The guide provides information and direction for introductory study and planning for action related to security issues and peace education. It is recommended that facilitators of groups have available the Supplementary Resources decribed below for LEVEL II.

LEVEL II: This guide and the Supplementary Resources are aids for those who want to study in more depth. The materials in the packet of Supplementary Resources are written for a general audience. The packet is available from United Ministries in Education, c/o Educational Ministries—ABC, Valley Forge, PA 19481.

Four publications are included in the packet and are quoted extensively in this guide:

- *peaceworld*, by Michael McIntyre, Sister Luke Tobin, and Hazel L. Johns, Friendship Press, 1976. (This book will be referred to as *peaceworld* in the text, with page references.)

- *Militarism and the World Military Order*, by Ernest Regehr, World Council of Churches, 1980. (This book will be referred to as *Militarism* in the text, with page references.)

- *Toward a Dependable Peace: A Proprosal for an Appropriate Security System*, by Robert C. Johansen, Institute for World Order, 1978. (This book will be referred to as *Dependable Peace* in the text, with page references.)

- *Final Document of the World Congress on Disarmament Education*, UNESCO, 1980. (This book will be referred to as *Final Document* in the text, with page references.)

Also included in the packet are:

- *Peacekeeping*, by Jack Frankel, Margaret Carter, and Betty Reardon, Random House, 1974.
- "Recommendations on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education Concerning Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms," UNESCO, 1974.
- "Conflict Resolution," by Martha Pomainville, Cynthia Blankenship, and Barbara Stanford, *Designs for English*, Learning Ventures/Bantam Books, 1977.
- Various brochures and flyers.

LEVEL III: Resources for this level are the guide, the packet of Supplementary Resources, and copies of items on the list of Recommended Readings in the appendix. The Recommended Readings were written by specialists in the relevant subject areas. However, they can be understood by non-specialists whose concern with the issues leads them to further study in preparation for more effective action. Throughout the study guide, reference is made to these Recommended Readings.

Time Needed

The guide is organized into this introduction, four study sessions, and one action-planning session. Each of these sessions should be at least one and one-half hours long. The entire LEVEL I study program using only this guide will probably require a minimum of *nine hours*. For LEVEL II, participants would use both the guide and the materials in the packet of Supplementary Resources, so sessions should be at least two hours. Therefore, the total LEVEL II program is likely to require at least *twelve hours*. Use of the Recommended Readings in LEVEL III calls for three-hour sessions. These could be split into two segments of 90 minutes each. The total for LEVEL III study would be at least *fifteen hours*.

Responses Intended

In each session, three kinds of responses are expected from those engaged in this study/action program, regardless of the level of involvement.

1) Awareness of the problem

The first phase is based upon reading the guide and, if the group chooses, the Supplementary Resources and/or Recommended Readings. Questions for review of the content come at the end of each chapter under the heading: What have we learned? Discussion of these questions will help the group reflect on the information. This stage of information acquisition and problem awareness may also be augmented by the use of audio-visuals if time and budget permit.

2) Analysis of the issues

The second phase is analyzing the information. The group can consider such dimensions as effects upon the perceived and real security of the world, our nation, and our communities. The group can study effects upon and relation to democratic and Christian values, as well as effects upon education in general. This study process can indicate areas where education is needed in order to change conditions which negatively affect our security and values. Questions for analysis at the end of each chapter are listed under: What does it mean?

3) Action

The third phase calls for the group to develop action responses to deal with the conditions discovered. Actions particularly necessary are those which will educate our society in ways of assuring community, national, and global security. Pointers toward possible action are included at the end of each chapter under the heading: What can we do?

These three kinds of responses comprise three phases of learning: awareness, analysis, and action. Awareness and analysis are valuable to the individual learner for personal reasons, and to the society for the contribution made to "informed citizenship." But society is not likely to change, nor are new security systems likely to be instituted, unless study leads to action. For effective peace education programs in general, and especially for Christian peace education programs, action must be included as a specified learning objective. Action is a significant and necessary component of the learning process itself.

However, action is more than the third phase of the learning process. It is also a tool to initiate further cycles of learning, for action can change reality and help us become aware of dimensions of the changed reality. Further study and analysis lead to further and more effective actions toward the achievement of our preferred world of peace and justice. Many educators believe that action itself is a productive learning device.

The situation we face requires no less than the most informed and vigorous actions we can devise. However, whether action is intended or not, we urge all to undertake the study. It is vital that all citizens understand these issues. An informed and concerned public can help create the social climate in which peace education programs can more readily be developed in schools, churches, and all types of learning environments.

The actions that are part of this learning program should be simple, practical, short-term efforts that can be undertaken and reported on from session to session. The actions should be related to each other so they build upon one another. They can then provide the foundation for a full-scale peace education effort in your community. Responding to the three overarching questions—What have we learned? What does it mean? and What can we do?—can lead the group through awareness and analysis to action.

Guidelines for Conducting the Study/Action Group

The size of the study/action group can vary from five to twenty-five or thirty people. No matter how large the group, all can participate together in the content portion of the sessions providing awareness of the problem. This can happen through review of the narrative of this guide, a summary of the Supplementary Resources and/or the Recommended Readings, or the viewing of a film or filmstrip. Questions for clarification can be considered in the large group. However, serious discussion is more effective in small groups.

For review and discussion, groups should not be larger than ten. The full participation of all members in groups larger than ten is difficult. Discussion groups of six to eight people are most effective. If your study/action group is larger than ten people, subdivide the group for discussion.

Groups undertaking action can conduct the planning and reporting in the small discussion group and share later with the entire larger group. The integration of action into the study process should be determined by the time available, the size of the group, the nature of the action intended, the available resources, and, of course, the preferences of the people in the group.

The task of facilitating the discussion can rotate among group members. At least two people should be prepared to facilitate each session. This provides insurance against the absence of a facilitator. Also, when both are present, they can share the task of leadership. Discussion can be enriched by joint preparation. Each can be responsible for key issues, assuring that the most crucial ones are covered. Leaders can also try to assure that the pros and cons of each issue discussed are adequately analyzed.

Essential preparation for the facilitators is to study thoroughly the narrative contained in this guide. The group can have a richer discussion

if the facilitators have read the supplementary materials in the packet. Reporting on those materials is another task that can be shared. At least one person in each discussion group should be thoroughly familiar with each of the materials so as to serve as a resource person on that material. As noted before, the Supplementary Resources Packet is available from United Ministries in Education.

Similar procedures can be used if the Recommended Readings are used. If the Recommended Readings are not available in your local library, they could be purchased as a Study Group Library and made available to the entire group on a reserve basis. They might also be purchased by group members with sufficient interest in the topic to want to build their own libraries. These people could then serve as resources for the groups.

It is recommended that the facilitators give some thought to suggested action strategies in preparation for each session. This need not take the action planning function away from the other participants. It can serve as a "pump primer" and assure that some action will be taken after each session. Action taken can then be reported on for expanded awareness and analysis at subsequent sessions.

Facilitators should remember that their primary function is to initiate and facilitate, not to "carry on" the discussion. Facilitators may want to prepare other questions and approaches in addition to those suggested. Significant learning cannot take place nor action be effectively planned without involvement by *all* participants. A high level of participation occurs when each participant feels responsible for the vigor and depth of the discussion. One way of developing this sense of responsibility is by rotating the facilitation task among members of the group.

Specific Steps for Program

Three essential stages are necessary in organizing and conducting study/action groups: planning the program, helping the sessions to happen, and evaluating the program. Following are ideas about planning and evaluation.

☐*Planning* involves setting of general and specific objectives for each session, assessing resources, and scheduling. One person concerned about security issues can initiate the work toward holding a study/action program. However, planning and evaluating are best done by a team of three or four people who might come from a single congregation or from several.

Before beginning to plan, all team members should read through this guide and the supplementary material in preparation for the program.

Plan for two sets of objectives:

•*learnings*, i.e., what the participants are to learn. Examples: Participants will gain information about the volume of military spending and its effect on meeting economic and social needs. Participants will become informed about proposals for alternative security systems.

•*actions*, i.e., goals the group might work to achieve by establishing peace education in various learning environments in the community. Examples: The study group will plan a peace education unit for use in the congregation's family life education program. The group will plan a training workshop on "Teaching about the Arms Race in Secondary School Social Studies," to be offered to all social studies teachers in the community.

Try to create at least five objectives in each category. These will be the basis for session objectives and for evaluation.

The assessment of resources should include two categories – human and material resources. Human resources include the people known to be interested in and concerned about these issues. Such people will be most likely to focus attention and energies on concrete objectives. They may also know others who are concerned.

In listing those who are concerned, include people of more than one opinion or tendency. The planning group needs to consider how open-ended it wishes to be. Then, in light of the learning and action objectives, make a decision. Too great a diversity or polarity does not necessarily make the group learning richer and more meaningful. However, consider including among the resources individuals representing a broad spectrum of opinion ranging from those who advocate continued and larger weapons expenditure and development to those who espouse immediate unilateral disarmament. Members of the military might be periodic resource persons, if not regular members of the group.

Among those who can provide the needed experience and background, and whose participation would greatly enhance your action possibilities are: school teachers and/or teacher educators, peace movement activists and/or members of peace-oriented organizations, persons from your own congregation involved in any peace- and/or education-related denominational activities. Among the best human resources are concerned parents who take seriously their citizen's responsibility to participate in the formulation and improvement of educational policies and practices, especially school board and PTA members. If such people have not already joined the study/action program, try to interest some. Their involvement may facilitate more effective action.

As you consider human resources, make a list of peace organizations and military-related associations in your community. These provide material as well as human resources. A list of such groups can be found in the appendix. People in these centers welcome questions and may provide phone consultations or short visits if you do not have your own local human resources.

The minimal material resources for the study/action program are one copy of this guide for each participant and one packet of the Supplementary Resources for each person on the planning team. While it is desirable

that each participant have a supplementary packet, these packets could be shared among session facilitators. It would be very helpful to have at least one set of the Recommended Readings. Before purchasing these, check for their availability at your local library, school system, colleges or universities, and peace resource centers which may be in your area. This step will alert these institutions to your program, and you might enlist their help in the program itself or involve them in ongoing peace education efforts which result from the study/action group. Check among individuals known to be interested in peace to see if they might have any of the Recommended Readings.

Scheduling the program involves setting the place, dates, and hours for the sessions and designating facilitators for each session. The sessions could be once a week, on a weekend with several sessions, or one or two days of successive weekends. Decisions about scheduling depend on availability of people to be involved, community customs about such groups as this, and the amount of background material and degree of detail planned. A series of sessions with increasing depth and involvement might be planned around the three levels of study/action described on page 7. Check with the community education department of your local college or university about organizing courses and enrolling participants for the LEVEL III series.

Assign facilitators for each session. Consider special resource people. For example, Session Three on the war system might be enriched by a representative from a peace organization and one from the military; Session Five on learning objectives by a classroom teacher or teachers and/or the parents of school-age children.

☐ *Evaluation* of the program is essential in order to know what to do next and to increase the chances of achieving your objectives. A basis for evaluation is the sets of objectives developed by the planning team. Consider also what the participants appear to have learned and the steps which have been taken toward establishing ongoing peace education efforts in your community. One way of evaluating the achievement of the learning objectives is to give a list of them to participants and ask them to note briefly how the objectives were achieved for them. The action objectives might be reviewed and discussed in Session Six as a foundation for ongoing planning. One way to get results and evaluate the action objectives is to draft a specific plan for peace education and assess your accomplishments step by step. Session Six contains more information on this possibility.

At its 1975 assembly, the World Council of Churches called on the churches to give high priority to these issues and to "raise consciousness about the dangers of militarism and search for creative ways of educating for peace" (*Militarism*, p. xi). Every Christian has a responsibility to help the churches respond to this call. Active and full participation in

study of issues related to reversing the process of militarization and educating for peacemaking is one way to do that.

For Review, Discussion, and Action

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

1. What is militarism? What is militarization?

2. What evidence is cited to uphold the assertion that there is a world-wide trend toward militarization of most societies?

3. What is asserted to be the main basis of conflict and controversy over the issues of militarism and militarization?

4. What were the major conclusions of the survey of opinions and perceptions?

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

5. Do the study group planners agree with the assertions of the survey? What assumptions among the planners uphold agreement and/or incite disagreement among the planners? How will these agreements and disagreements be worked into the study plan for the group?

6. What learning objectives will the planners seek in designing the study plan?

7. What action objectives for the establishment of a peace education program in your community are possible? Are they possible for your group to achieve?

WHAT CAN WE DO?

8. What human resources do you need to facilitate your learning and carry out your proposed actions?

9. Is it most desirable for your group to engage at LEVEL I, II, or III in your study plan? Who is to be responsible for obtaining study materials. Which study materials will you use?

10. What schedule will you follow? Who will facilitate each session?

SESSION 2

HUMAN SECURITY—THE BASIS OF A PEACE SYSTEM

Objective: To learn about the various components of security, its relationship to peace, its frustration by militarization, and about the new learnings needed to achieve peace and security.

Contents

- ☐Relationship Between Peace and Security
- ☐Heavily Armed Insecurity: The Cycle of Deprivation and Violence
- ☐Development for Needs Fulfillment
- ☐Specific Obstacles to Needs Fulfillment Posed by Arms Race
- ☐For Review, Discussion, and Action

Background Readings

LEVEL I: Resource people and facilitators should read Session Two in this guide and these sections from the Supplementary Resources:

- *peaceworld:* Introduction and Part One, esp. pp. 7-8, 9-10, 12-18
- *Militarism:* pp. 33-49
- *Dependable Peace:* pp. 13-18

All participants should read Session Two in this guide, paying special attention to the quotes.

LEVEL II: All participants should read the sections listed above in the Supplementary Resources as well as Session Two in this guide. The facilitators should also read the asterisked items in the list of Recommended Readings (see appendix).

LEVEL III: All participants should read Session Two in this guide, the specified sections of the Supplementary Resources, and the Recommended Readings listed in the appendix.

Relationship Between Peace and Security

Many people define peace as the absence of war. The absence of war is sometimes referred to as "negative peace." Yet many who actively pursue peace go beyond that understanding to hold a more positive and complex vision of their goal. "Positive peace" refers to a set of positive, humane conditions that make up a preferred reality in which the causes of war have been overcome and the bases of security and community have been established. The National Council of Churches' task force on "The Mission of Building Peace" defined peace this way:

> **Peace is a world in which neither the overt violence of war nor the covert violence of unjust systems is used as an instrument for extending the interests of a particular nation or group. It is a world where basic human needs are met, and in which justice can be obtained and conflict resolved through nonviolent processes and human and material resources are shared for the benefit of all people. (*peaceworld*, p. 7, from the preface by Bruce L. Jones, chairperson of the Task Force.)**

Security is also a complex concept. It is a term which carries multiple meanings. It may be this lack of a widely held common definition which accounts for much of the controversy surrounding security issues. The term is used here as the condition which is an essential basis for peace. It implies a broad and comprehensive meaning suitable to the breadth of the concept of integral, positive peace. *Human security includes all aspects of the human experience which permit people to live reasonably free of fear and to pursue the multiple goals and tasks of human beings in society. Human security is a condition based upon the expectation that human needs will be met and that people will not likely suffer harm at the hands of other human beings.*

A society or community in which the majority live with such an expectation can be said to be a peaceful society. If its members need not fear attack or injury from others, little overt violence would be expected. If most can also reasonably expect to have their basic needs met, no significant covert violence or severe injustice would be likely. No society can totally guarantee security or offer adequate protection from natural disasters such as earthquakes and floods. However, except for times when such a threat is imminent, this kind of harm does not cause daily insecurity and fear. Similarly, the inevitability of death does not dissuade people from cherishing life. Precautions can be taken. Remedial measures can be developed. Most people live with these possibilities rationally. They accept what cannot be avoided. They do what can be done to be as secure as possible in the event of unavoidable disaster.

In fact, this very *acceptance* of natural disasters and death provides people with a kind of security. Those with religious faith find security in the acceptance of God's will. Others frequently find security in knowing that the community will respond as best it can and that the safety and needs of all in the community will be considered equally. These expectations are as basic to a social system at peace as the expectations of having needs met are to security.

But such is not the situation in the case of humanly produced disasters such as economic crises, ecological catastrophe, and warfare. While a nation or a community may be at peace facing the possibility of natural disasters, the insecurity arising from the possibility of crime, riots, war, depression, or eco-catastrophe results in peacelessness. It also stimulates people to become "secure," to be "defended" against the possibilities of such harm. We gear up to "wage war" on the "enemies"—other people, inflation, poverty, or nuclear accidents. Thus, the social system is at war. Indeed, so constant is this struggle for us these days that we talk about living in a *war system*.

Peace and security are inextricably interrelated. Human beings have always sought both. Unfortunately, they do not seek both with equal vigor. Thus, we have only limited historic experience with *peace systems* of the kind described above in the definition provided by the National Council of Churches' task force.

The struggle for security is a constant factor in human history. One form of security comes from companionship and sharing and knowing that the human species will continue. The search for that security led human beings to form families. Human families seeking security from the threats of other creatures and the natural elements took shelter in caves. For a sense of security that their basic food needs would be met, human beings established agricultural settlements. To protect and manage their agricultural settlements, they developed governmental structures. Warfare developed as humans decided to protect themselves from harm from other human groups and to expand their own territories.

Humans continually search for means to be more secure, to meet more complex needs, and to be free from threat. People feel threatened by a variety of potential harms inflicted by other human beings, as well as by the elements and natural disasters. A human quest is the search for an ultimate form of security. People long for that which will provide not only the meeting of needs but also opportunities for full personal and social development. Some contemporary societies and ideologies promise to provide such security. None, however, has so far actually fulfilled that promise. Few, if any, societies offer to *all* of their members the basic security of meeting fundamental survival needs and of truly protecting them from all harm.

Heavily Armed Insecurity: The Cycle of Deprivation and Violence

In the United States of America, recent newspaper articles have reported a high level of insecurity in the citizenry. The insecurity does not result from fear of foreign enemies. It derives from the basic conditions of life in the U.S., and from the way in which people perceive these conditions. Many citizens, particularly those in large cities, live in constant fear. Violent crime is rampant. People feel defenseless against that threat. More citizens are threatened by the very real possibility of harm at the hands of people in this country than are losing sleep over the "Soviet Threat." A minister calling for government help to apprehend the murderer of black children in Atlanta said, "It is not the Russians who are killing our children." Another real and widespread fear is of unemployment and inflation, which erode our economic well-being. One survey showed that crime and the economy are the paramount concerns of citizens of the U.S.

The U.S. is probably the most heavily armed nation in the world. In spite of this emphasis on "national security" and military preparedness, we are a nation lacking fundamental human security. Indeed, many people assert that the real insecurity of our nation, and of most nations, derives from the very emphasis on national security and the expenditure of resources on weapons which we profess we do not intend to use. Real security might be possible if money and energy were used to provide goods and services to fulfill needs, reduce the causes of violence, and prevent the crimes which truly threaten our security. An excellent statement of this reality is made in great detail by Patricia and Gerald Mische in *Toward a Human World Order*. The statistical data providing factual validation is clearly present in the annual report entitled *World Military and Social Expenditures*. (See Recommended Readings in the appendix for information about these resources.)

When human needs are unmet, the experience of deprivation and the threat of renewed or continued deprivation produces fear, hostility, and frequently violence in individuals and groups. In how many stories, television dramas, and newspaper articles was there an unloved or abused child who grew up to be a violent criminal? How many incidents have occurred in recent years in which deprived groups in a society have been driven to violent expression of their suffering? How many peoples have turned to armed struggle to secure bread and dignity?

Social violence and warfare can be described as a form of pathology, a disease. Few people would be satisfied with simply treating the symptoms of a severely debilitating or life-threatening disease. Yet, we continue to respond to most forms of violence by preparing for the continued incidence of social violence and the repeated outbreak of warfare,

rather than by trying to eliminate their causes. We have studied the major life-threatening human diseases. We have researched their causes and treatments and invented ways to prevent them. Through research and education we have eliminated much disease-induced human suffering. Both material and human resources have been saved which were formerly laid waste by endemic illness.

Many people were initially skeptical of the effectiveness of vaccinations or the importance of clean water. Through demonstration, education, and carefully orchestrated public programs, people have been taught about diseases and how to avoid or eliminate them. We have made an improvement in the level of public health in many parts of the world. Yet few steps have been taken to cure or eradicate the greatest of all threats to human life and well-being—war and the preparation for war.

Basic to a program of peacemaking is teaching about the causes of war and violence. One of the causes is the deprivation of the means to fulfill human needs. The consequent insecurity perpetuates the cycle of violence and warfare. Another significant lesson to be taught by peace education is that deprivation is not only a cause of violence, but is a form of violence in itself. The lessons are not easy, but they are essential.

> **We are familiar with the violence of war; no one needs to be reminded of its pain, suffering and tragedy. But we are not so well acquainted with the hidden, or covert, violence of unjust systems. Often the accusation that hidden violence is accomplished by the way in which goods and services are produced, how and to whom they are made available, and how they are bought and sold seems too complicated. Or the charge that laws are used to benefit the powerful rather than those too powerless to gain control of their own lives seems a reckless and provocative statement. Whether or not we can readily visualize these forms of hidden violence, they are likely to continue. The call to church people, and to all of God's people, is for us to try to understand these connections and to respond at the starting point of justice—not charity or generosity alone. *(peaceworld*, pp. 15-16)**

A program in peace education should explicate the causes of war and violence, the various forms of violence, and the way all of these factors interrelate in perpetuating war and deprivation. Only by understanding these interrelationships can we hope to learn to transcend these problems.

A hope for peace lies in many people learning the skills and gaining the understandings fundamental to peacemaking. Public health depends on the public's knowledge of basic sanitation, nutrition, and the rudiments of health care. Similarly, the public must know what peace is, what prevents it, and how to attain it. We need to understand the damage of covert violence as we understand the danger of disease in uncontrolled germs. While not readily visible, both cause suffering and death.

> In our time this hope for peace is forced to take its place alongside the reality that those who have been the victims of covert, or hidden, violence by the powerful with their economic, legal and social systems may choose overt violence as the only adequate tool for restoring some kind of balance and justice. As Christians and as the people of God, we can hope for nonviolence to be at the heart of what is done by those who must resist the hidden forms of injustice which come to them. We ought to expect, however, that those who are driven to the breaking point by unyielding unfairness may, indeed, choose to use violence as their last resort. Thus, if we would wish to act on the basis of our hope for nonviolence, we must be sure we can see the hidden actions manipulating law, economics and politics against those who are marginal. (*peaceworld*, p. 16)

The lessons of peace education are not easy ones, neither in the learning of the facts nor in the living out of their meaning. The complex interrelationships between peace, justice, and security require that we "study harder than we have ever studied before and work in ways we haven't yet worked." (*peaceworld*, p. 39)

But we have never before had so much at stake. We have to educate ourselves to change the entire world system from militarization and war to security and peace. This means confronting all forms of violence. Improving public health required changes in areas ranging from personal habits to laws regulating sanitation standards. Reducing violence requires us to change behaviors and structures. In particular, we need to learn who is most profoundly affected by the "epidemic" of militarization. Even in the absence of formal warfare, the human deprivation resulting from the present system is of dimensions equal to the most devastating of wars.

> No shot need ever be fired, no bomb dropped and no missile launched for people by the millions to feel first-hand the destruction and devastation that lie in the wake of the now worldwide race toward greater and greater military prowess. Though we seem to avoid the catastrophe of nuclear holocaust, catastrophe remains the daily experience of the majority in the Third World and of significant minorities in the industrialized world. The violation of humanity represented by neglected education, inadequate or non-existent health services, malnutrition and repressive regimes (kept in place by arms delivered to the poor from the factories of the rich), is a destructive power that seems less devastating than war only because its true magnitude is not easily measured. (*Militarism*, p. 37)

Clearly the poor of the world suffer more violence and have less security than even the very "insecure" peoples of rich nations such as ours. This quotation is a catalog of unfulfilled needs. It is important to understand

how the process of militarization impedes the fulfillment of human needs and creates greater insecurity.

Development for Needs Fulfillment: Essential Requisite to Security and Peace

Human needs can be categorized in various ways. In this study/action program, we are dealing with such questions as public policy, world development, war and peace. Therefore, the most useful categorization of human needs for this study program would be the areas of economic needs, social needs, and political needs. This is not intended to downplay those individual and personal needs which can only be met by satisfying, intimate relationships, by fulfilling spiritual experiences, and by aesthetic activities. It is meant only to focus on the immediate structural questions which stand in the way of meeting personal needs for so many of the human family. Economic, social, and political needs are all severely frustrated by the process of militarization which has so tenacious a hold on present world politics.

Economic Needs: Economic needs encompass not only the basic survival needs of food, clothing, and shelter, but also the means and mechanisms for families and individuals to meet these basic needs through employment and education. We can recognize several economic needs:

—the need to work;

—the need to contribute to the common well-being of the community as a means of personal fulfillment;

—the need for education, not only to fulfill personal and social needs, but also to learn how to contribute to and participate in society.

Social Needs: Those human needs which are fulfilled by society or by the groups to which humans belong are social needs. Included are those such as the need:

—for recognition of one's personhood;

—to be affirmed as a valuable person;

—to have one's human dignity acknowledged;

—to have access to the benefits of being in society with other human beings;

—to have access to the means to communicate with and exchange ideas with other human beings.

These needs are generally fulfilled by social institutions such as churches, schools, voluntary groups, and in some cases by professional services.

Political Needs: People also feel a need to participate in making the decisions that will affect their lives. Certain legally acknowledged political human rights are a recognition of human needs just as economic and social rights are.

While "development" frequently connotes modernization or industrialization, we propose another, more "human" definition. *Development comprises those processes whereby societies gain the capacity to fulfill the human needs of their people*. Such processes are profoundly impeded by militarization and the arms race.

> The social, political, technological and industrial options of countries are affected by their participation in the arms race. International policies, not only in the military field but also in fields of international trade in co-operation and exchanges generally, are influenced by the climate of confrontation and apprehension engendered by the arms race. Many of the major problems faced by the world community, problems of development, of economic imbalance and inflation, of pollution, energy and raw materials, of trade relations and technology, and so forth, are enhanced and exacerbated by the arms race. Progress in other areas such as health, education, housing, and many more, is delayed due to lack of resources. (*Militarism*, p. 37)
>
> There is a clear relationship between the arms race and the social and economic order. The arms competition of the super-powers and other countries involved in weapons design and development fosters the present unjust economic order and prevents the principles of the new international economic order from being implemented. Governments and multinational corporations participate in military escalation at the expense of economic and social development. In the process, available resources are misused. Disarmament is therefore essential for the proper utilization of human material resources available for social development and for the establishment of a new international economic order. (*Militarism*, p. 39)

The human costs of the arms race are seen in the limits on Third World development and the lack of global economic equity. The arms race also impedes the development of the industrialized countries while it erodes their traditional political values. The militarization process expands the military sector at the expense of the civilian sector. This trend indicates a significant shift in values. The ways we use our resources indicate our operational values. For example, 50% of all U.S. engineers and scientists have been drawn from civilian industry into military industry.

> We can and do build highly accurate missiles and high-performance nuclear submarines, but we have forgotten how to build a decent railway system or even a decent railway car. We can and do build bombs that are capable of decimating any nation on earth, but seem to be incapable of developing a cheap and effective automobile pollution-control device. We can and do build high-performance

rocket engines but we can't develop the techniques for the production of steel. In industry after industry in the United States there is a pattern of technological retardation. If you look at the steel industry, in which the U.S. was at one time the leader, and ask where new technology has been developed, the answer is Japan and Germany. In electronics the U.S. technology is highly developed, but the kind we know how to make is of a military type, not cheap and efficient civilian type electronics. (*Militarism*, p. 47)

The degree to which military priorities and expenditures retard our capacity to fulfill human needs can be seen most clearly in possible alternative uses of our resources. The following figures show what we could do but are neglecting to do because we are not expending our resources in true development.

ALTERNATIVES

At current world prices, the diversion of only 10 per cent of world spending to development projects would yield $42 billion for a "swords-into-ploughshares" program. With such a goal, the world at the turn of the century could be quite a different place. It would find that it could afford cleaner air and water. The tax burden would be reduced. There would be more jobs and food, less inflation, benign energy sources, better health care and education, quite possibly a deeper sense of fellowship replacing tensions and hate. The following is a list of development tasks that could be achieved by even this modest reduction of military spending:

International program for clean air	$5.0 billion
Safe water for all within the decade	4.0 billion
Family planning, maternal health services	1.5 billion
Primary health care facilities and personnel	1.5 billion
Development of renewable energy resources	3.0 billion
Training programs for young people	4.0 billion
Research and development for labor-intensive low-cost technology	2.0 billion
Primary schools and teacher training	5.5 billion
Direct food aid for the hungry	5.0 billion
Literacy drive emphasizing skills for women	2.0 billion
Vaccine protection for all children	0.5 billion
Development aid for the small farmer	6.0 billion
Global program to wipe out malaria	2.0 billion

Source: *World Military and Social Expenditures - 1979*

A full and authentic security might develop if serious and careful consideration were given to such alternative suggestions. Policies directed at meeting human needs would indicate a commitment to the development of a peace system. The trends toward militarization weaken that commitment and sorely impede the development of peace and security as they frustrate the fulfillment of human needs.

Specific Obstacles to Needs Fulfillment Posed by Arms Race

Specific examples of frustration of human needs will help to give us a clearer picture of the way in which the achievement of adequate and authentic security is undermined by the present arms race and militarization process. The following quote summarizes the global consequences in the economic area which can be attributed to the means we use to seek security.

> The failures of the present security system are as serious for many persons living at peace as for those suffering war. Consuming $350 billion every year, worldwide military programs stimulate inflation, increase unemployment (compared to the number of jobs possible with equal investment in non-military production), raise costs of many consumer goods and public services, deplete scarce resources required for meeting basic human needs, slow economic improvement for the poor, and increase environmental pollution. The military priorities of the present international system leave more than half a billion persons malnourished; half of the world's people without adequate shelter and health care; and half of the world's school-age children without teachers and schools. *(Dependable Peace*, p. 15)

The relationship between military spending and unemployment is shown in the following:

> In fact, military spending is parasitic and represents a major burden for industrial economies. Military production has no special job-creating qualities. Indeed, various studies now show that military production actually generates unemployment. To cite one such study, a recent report on *The Impact of Military Spending on the Machinists Union* shows that as the military budget goes up in the United States, and procurement contracts rise, machinists' jobs decline. The report shows that members of the International Association of Machinists, which includes aerospace workers, suffer a new loss of job opportunities when military spending is high because the number of IAM jobs which are foregone in [the production of] civilian goods and services because of tax monies going to the military exceeds the number of jobs generated by military contracts.

Furthermore, military production diverts investments and research and development funds away from civilian industries and actually retards the latter, making them less competitive in the international trading community. (*Militarism*, pp. 44-45)

The social and political needs of the individual, particularly those recognized as "human rights," are also severely frustrated by the arms race and consequent militarization. The effect of the arms trade on human rights has been well documented by research done by members of the International Peace Research Association. Much of this research has been published in the *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*. Some of these articles appear in the issues of the *Bulletin* listed in the Recommended Readings in the appendix.

In sum, the offenses to human dignity and violations of rights which are increased by the arms trade and the growth of military regimes are:

- the use of torture for political purposes;
- the strengthening of the armed forces, making possible military takeovers which are often accompanied by severe violations of human rights, including torture and imprisonment; and
- forms of censorship which impede aesthetic and artistic expressions, as well as political participation.

A further example of the frustration of social needs is the continuation and aggravation of various severe forms of discrimination, particularly racism and sexism. It has been noted that the emphasis on military preparedness places the heaviest burden for military service on the poor. In the U.S., these poor are also likely to be non-white. An obvious and severe system of discrimination supported by militarism is apartheid. Some observers believe that if South Africa were not so well protected by the world military order and in possession of nuclear weapons technology, the apartheid system could not continue.

The frustrations of political needs resulting from world militarization take different forms from the frustrations of economic need. However, they are equally serious and affect both the industrial and developing nations. As noted above, militarism in many countries has resulted in gross violations of human rights. Except for those favored by the military, it has also cut off fulfillment of the need for political participation and for self-determination at both the personal and social levels. The process by which political needs are frustrated is described in the following:

The military obstructs increased popular participation in decision-making for a variety of reasons. The military, for example, is unlikely to accept a self-reliant economy because that would weaken the possibility of obtaining foreign exchange to cover arms imports and other technologies related to military buildup. Furthermore,

participatory democracy tends toward decentralization and toward more appropriate and labor intensive technology, which in turn gives priority to basic needs. The military, on the other hand, represents an entirely different organizational structure, with a high degree of centralization and hierarchy. The emphasis is on command and subordination, on discipline rather than creativity, with alternative thinking and approaches frequently defined as "subversive." As the military's role in denying popular participation in government increases, respect for fundamental human rights diminishes and individuals are required to forego normal rights in favor of "order." (*Militarism*, p. 43)

In *Toward a Human World Order*, the Misches indicate how similar frustration in the form of limited public information on crucial issues and in the concentration of decision-making power on national security matters has limited democratic participation in the industrialized countries. The "national security state," whether in democratic constitutionalism or in outright military dictatorship, is probably the greatest enemy of participatory democracy in the world. Such a national situation raises extreme value conflicts and public dilemmas.

One of the major purposes of peace education should be to prepare citizens to deal with the value conflicts inherent in militarization and to resolve the dilemmas which impede the establishment of a peace system.

For Review, Discussion, and Action

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

1. Is the definition of human security offered at the beginning of this session compatible with your ideas about security? List components which comprise security for yourself as an individual and as part of a family, a community, a nation, and the world. How do these "levels" of security interrelate?

2. Is the definition of peace by the National Council of Churches Task Force on page 14 helpful in clarifying your understanding of peace? In what ways has it changed your own views of what comprises peace?

3. Do you agree with the definitions of violence offered in the section on "Heavily Armed Insecurity"? What criteria should be applied to measure or "quantify" violence? to measure or "quantify" peace?

4. What are the relationships between human needs and violence? between fear and means for providing security?

5. What are the major obstacles cited in the sections on "Development of Needs Fulfillment" and "Specific Obstacles to Needs Fulfillment"

that are blocking fulfillment of human needs? What other obstacles could be listed? What has your experience been with obstacles like these?

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

6. What persons, agencies, and/or institutions are expected to provide security at each significant level of social organization—individual, family, community, nation, world? Are these adequate to the security tasks for which they are responsible? What are their strengths and weaknesses?

7. What is your definition of peace? From what sources do you expect peace to be forthcoming? Are these sources able to operate adequately in the present social and political systems or structures? What values appear to guide these systems? Are these your values? Are these the values you want children to learn?

8. What do you perceive to be the major threats to the security of your own family and community? How should we respond to these threats?

9. What do you feel your community should understand about violence and security? What do you want children to learn about violence and security?

10. What do you want children to learn about development and developing countries? about war and peace? about the military and military service? What should the young be taught about militarism and militarization?

WHAT CAN WE DO?

11. Conduct a security survey of your community to see if the assessments made in discussion of question 6 are an adequate reflection of the real situation.

12. Research what is taught in your community schools and colleges about these issues. Try to evaluate curriculum content as to adequacy and appropriateness in terms of the values you hold and obstacles to peace you have identified.

13. Research the movements and organizations attempting to educate the public about peace and security issues. Be sure to include a full range of groups—from the military who advocate more advanced and larger quantities of weapons, to those who take a pacifist position. Assess their basic positions, their assumptions about how the security measures they advocate would operate, and the values which underlie their positions. Decide what citizens should know and understand in order to respond effectively to the objectives of these organizaitons.

SESSION 3

NATIONAL SECURITY: THE DILEMMAS OF THE WAR SYSTEM

Objective: To explore the concept of national security and the adequacy of military preparedness for the maintenance of national security.

Contents

☐Dilemma: National Security or Military Preparedness
☐Dilemma: Basic Assumptions about National Security are Outdated
☐Dilemma: Security Decreases as Weaponry Increases
☐Dilemma: Christian Principles Conflict with Deterrence Policy
☐Dilemma: Arms Control Agreements Encourage Weapons Development
☐For Review, Discussion, and Action

Background Readings

LEVEL I: Resource people and facilitators should read Session Three in this guide and these sections from the Supplementary Resources:

- *peaceworld:* pp. 43-48
- *Militarism:* Introduction and pp. 3-29
- *Dependable Peace:* pp. 13-18

All participants should read Session Three in this guide, paying special attention to the quotations.

LEVEL II: All participants should read the sections listed above in the Supplementary Resources as well as Session Three in this guide. The facilitators should also read the asterisked items in the list of Recommended Readings (see appendix).

LEVEL III: All participants should read Session Three in this guide, the specified sections of the Supplementary Resources, and the Recommended Readings listed in the appendix.

Dilemma: National Security or Military Preparedness

The largest and most powerful sub-unit of the human family is the nation. It might be expected that human security could be assured by the nation, particularly by its political structure, the nation-state. But such is not the case. The world has become very complex and so has the problem of providing human security. But the concept of national security has not. The process of militarization has, in fact, narrowed popular notions of security.

Rather than becoming more broad and complex with the growing complexities of our times, the concept of national security seems to have become more narrow. The term "national security" connotes only military preparedness for national defense. Of course, defense has always been a significant component of national security, but only a component of it. "Military preparedness" is an even narrower concept of security than that held by the founders of our country. The phrases of the Preamble to the American Constitution provide both a definition of national security and a statement of the purposes of the federal government. It includes most of those broad areas of human security previously defined as economic, social, and political security. It suggests that the security of our nation includes "justice . . . domestic tranquility . . . the common defense . . . the general welfare . . . liberty."

Our system of government came into being as the European nation-state became the main force of world politics and the largest single political unit. The nation-state system was imposed on the rest of the world during the colonial era of the seventeenth through the twentieth century. As we consider issues of world peace and global security, it is important to remember that the nation-state is neither an ancient nor a universal human institution.

During that same period, European political philosophies developed which gave human beings the right to expect certain benefits in return for their support of this new political unit, the nation-state. The European nation-state was the protector of personal rights and the agent to assure justice and to defend its citizens from outside attack and other harm. None of these rights, however, extended to the people of the colonized countries; protection of rights and fundamental justice were for the colonizers only. This form of exclusion laid the basis for the exploitation of what is today called the Third World.

These notions about justice and rights are embodied in the U.S. Constitution. So is "the general welfare," which is the basis for placing the responsibility for other security needs on the nation-state. This notion of the general welfare comes into play in the contemporary controversy over the emphasis on military preparedness to assure national security which is bought at the price of foregoing other aspects of human security.

The cost is clearer when we reflect upon the fact that modern weaponry makes it impossible for any nation to prevent or defend itself against a nuclear attack or the use of chemical and biological weapons. In a nuclear age, no effective military preparation is possible for an assured defense of the national security. In fact, considering the concepts on which our nation was founded, the present system actually decreases the national security.

Dilemma: Basic Assumptions about National Security Are Outdated

The concept of national security which currently prevails places too much emphasis on military preparedness. It is also based upon a set of assumptions which are not valid. Let us examine four of them.

Assumption #1: All people of an entire nation have the same common interest. Any conflicting interests among sub-groups within the nation are seen by all sub-groups as secondary to the common interest of the entire nation. In other words, a racial or ethnic minority may be expected to place its own interests below those of the nation-state. War movies, especially those about the two World Wars, memorialize such "patriotic sacrifice." Cited as "proof" of this assumption is the fact that many American Blacks enlist in the armed forces and have served in numbers beyond their percentage of the population in our national wars. When this proof is cited, however, note is not taken that military service is often the only employment open to Black youth. Another expectation arising from this assumption is that the poor will be willing to remain poor for a longer period of time if that is required in the interest of national security.

Assumption #2: This assumption probably derives from the first. The nation-state serves the interest of all human groups better than either smaller or larger political units. Nation-states are assumed to be more effective units of governance than are provinces or ethnic tribes or local communities. They are assumed to be preferable to international regional organizations and certainly to world government. Global and regional cooperation have, indeed, developed to a great degree since the end of World War II. Yet, simultaneously, nationalism has increased. New nation-states have proliferated espousing nationalism the more fiercely because of their colonial experience.

Economic interests among industrial countries have converged, often through the development of multi-national corporations. Regional coordination has emerged through such political associations as the European Common Market, the Organization of American States, or the Organization of African Unity. The functions and purposes of these regional units are limited. The ultimate political power of "sovereignty" rests with the nation-states. No political authority in the entire international system is

higher than that of the nation-state. Neither can any political authority within the nation-state challenge its sovereignty.

Sovereign power places a heavy burden on the nation-state. This burden is even more demanding than that which infallibility places upon the Pope. The Pope is limited to matters of faith and morals, but the nation-state has no limits at all on its power and responsibility. A significant attribute of sovereign power is the exclusive authority given to the nation-state over the use of armed force. Robert Johansen indicates this power to be the major factor in the outbreak of war.

> The very nature of the system of sovereign states encourages armed rivalry between governments. Because the system provides no impartial, dependable way to prevent one government from violently coercing another, governments seek arms as a means of self-help. Regardless of who is in the White House or the Kremlin, and whether the perceived threat is one "ism" or another, arms build-ups will continue indefinitely—unless this system is fundamentally changed. As long as arms are allowed to be useful they will be acquired and used either to gain advantage in diplomacy or in combat. *(Dependable Peace*, p. 15)

Diplomacy and combat are the major mechanisms for the nation-state's defense of its interests against competing interests of other nation-states. Most nation-states, and their leadership, see themselves in constant competition with other nation-states. However, international competition has been gradually eroded in regional areas where the emphasis on integration has encouraged cooperation rather than competition. At the same time, competition has become more intense among and between ideological blocs and between industrial and developing nations. The ideological conflict between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. has fanned the flames of the arms race and led to the development of unprecedented instruments of mass destruction.

Assumption #3: By maintaining a large inventory of weapons and developing ever greater destructive capacity, nations can defend themselves against attack. This assumption is the most fallacious one, considering the nature of modern weaponry. The technology of modern weapons, particularly nuclear missiles against which no defense is possible, calls this assumption into serious question.

Assumption #4: The purposes of military forces are clearly distinct from those of police forces. To those concerned with the growth of militarism in the world, this is a most disturbing assumption. Military forces are believed to be exclusively charged with protecting the nation, while police forces are seen to guard against crime and domestic disorder. Recently, many countries have become so militarized that they are gov-

erned by military forces. The distinction between military and police forces has become so blurred that citizens of those countries often fear the police more than any foreign enemy. Such police do not defend the security of the citizens. Instead, they serve the interests of the ruling forces against those of the citizens and against the authentic national interest.

Militarism prevails where force is used within a nation to serve the interests of the ruling minority and when the military is able to control resources and political influence. The growth of military expenditures and the readiness to use military force in foreign affairs indicate to many that the U.S. is now more seriously threatened by militarism than by communism or Soviet aggression. When the interests of the military take precedence, when the citizenry serves the military rather than the other way around, the society has become militarized. Military might and power do not make the citizens of a nation secure.

Dilemma: Security Decreases as Weaponry Increases

Militarization and modern weaponry are the greatest threats not only to security but to the very survival of humanity. Nuclear weapons development has come to such a point that we are now more threatened by the probable use of such weapons than by the far more remote possibility of being left "defenseless" by general and complete disarmament. The following quotations from *Militarism and the World Military Order* point out some of the chief dangers inherent in nuclear weapons development.

> **While the five nuclear weapons powers (U.S., U.S.S.R., France, U.K., China) already possess weapons with sufficient explosive power to destroy recognizable life on this planet (since Hiroshima was destroyed on August 6, 1945, nuclear weapons arsenals have grown to the equivalence of over one million Hiroshima bombs), the nuclear arms race has entered a new and dangerous stage.**
>
> **No one really knows the number of nuclear weapons that now exist. . . . And still nuclear weapons continue to be built and tested. . . . The consequences of full-scale nuclear war are impossible to predict, but most estimates conclude that following a major nuclear exchange between the superpowers, in which only a fraction of available weapons would be used, all the major cities of the northern hemisphere would be destroyed. . . .**
>
> **At the beginning of the 1980s, it is possible to identify two dangerous developments in the nuclear arms race: the first is that technological innovations in weapons development have led to frightening changes in targeting doctrines and towards nuclear war-fighting strategies; and the second is the fact that nuclear weapons materials and technology are now widely available and no longer the exclusive domain of a few states. (pp. 6 and 7)**

> The uncomfortable truth is that today any country with an industrial base can make a nuclear bomb within a few years of deciding to do so, without any outside help. Nor need such a country go through the prior expense of acquiring a nuclear power generating station. The technical literature on nuclear weapons design and manufacture is publicly available, while inventory control of nuclear materials is sufficiently fragile and the uranium supply system sufficiently flexible to make materials to build a bomb accessible to any government that may wish to acquire it. Plutonium is currently being produced in more than 20 countries and will be produced in close to 30 countries by the mid-1980s. (p. 11)

Robert Johnasen agrees with this assessment by the World Council of Churches and with the predictions of the growing possibility of nuclear warfare. He attributes the danger not only to the development of such destructive weapons but, as noted earlier, to the international security system itself.

> The history of efforts to control arms reveals not only the failure to reduce them, but also the failure of the international political system to provide the security that all societies need and deserve. Present policies and the existing system repeatedly have denied us the opportunity to increase our security and to abolish arms.
>
> Consider how poorly the present security system functions. Although the United States is the most powerful nation on earth, we have no way to protect ourselves against a nuclear attack. Given the continuation of the trends noted above, our security will decline further in the future, even in the face of continuing efforts to maintain a very high level of military preparedness.
>
> . . . Although any single national government may believe that its security is increased if it accumulates more and more advanced weapons, for world society as a whole both the likelihood and the destructiveness of future wars are increased by the steady expansion of military arsenals and military influence around the world.
>
> The frequency of conventional war may also be increasing. . . .
>
> Radioactive fallout from the use of nuclear weapons by any country will affect persons far from the theater of war itself. In addition to the direct slaughter of millions of people from blast and fire, a general nuclear war will inject substances into the stratosphere which would seriously deplete the ozone density surrounding the entire planet and lead to increases in skin cancer and other maladies caused by ultraviolet radiation. . . .(*Dependable Peace*, pp. 13-14)

A strong denunciation of the arms race as the cause of this erosion of security was issued by the World Council of Churches Commission on

International Affairs in the statement from a conference on disarmament which they held in April, 1978. The statement sums up concisely both the erosion of the economic, social, and political bases of security, and the dangers to survival imposed by the arms race. More important, it hands down a judgment which should be considered by all Christians concerned with these issues.

> We are now living in the shadow of an arms race more intense, more costly, more widespread and more dangerous than the world has ever known. Never before has the human race been as close as it is now to total self-destruction. Today's arms race is an unparalleled waste of human and material resources; it threatens to turn the whole world into an armed camp; it aids repression and violates human rights; it promotes violence and insecurity in place of the security in whose name it is undertaken; it frustrates humanity's aspirations for justice and peace; it has no part in God's design for His world; it is demonic. *(Militarism*, p. ix)

Dilemma: Christian Principles Conflict with Deterrence Policy

Not every Christian and not all churches see the arms race in the same way. Even people who view war itself as evil can sometimes perceive cases in which warfare, even with the use of nuclear weapons, might be an evil of lesser degree than that against which war is unleashed. The conflicts among values and the contradictions between desired objectives and apparent reality have affected views of warfare held by Christians. Since the beginnings of the church, some Christians have questioned the unchallenged right of the state to engage in warfare as it saw fit.

Sister Mary Luke Tobin, in *peaceworld*, describes some of that history.

> What is the whole purpose and meaning of war, the most devastating kind of overt violence? How is it that Christians, persons of peaceable persuasion, are so ready to defend the use of arms? By looking back on our history, perhaps we can learn some of the reasons.
>
> What is the New Testament perspective on war? The overall picture puts the burden of proof on those who would use Jesus' life and teaching in order to justify going to war. . . .
>
> After the early period of Christian communal sharing, so beautifully described in Acts, the attitude toward violence in war could be defined as Christian pacifism. . . .
>
> . . . A decision to admit the contained use of arms resulted from the confrontation of Constantine with the pagan North. Christian teaching decided on the use of arms for self-protection and self-defense wherever "the enemy" was met.
>
> Later, the "just war" theory developed from the teaching of St. Augustine, and formed the basis for Christian teaching on war

for centuries to come. This theory holds that a war can be considered just only if the following conditions are present. It must—

—be declared by a legitimate authority;
—be carried out with a right intention;
—be undertaken only as a last resort;
—be waged on the basis of the principle of proportionality;
—have a reasonable chance of success;
—be waged with all moderation possible.

This theory seemed acceptable to Christians if conditions were ever such that it was possible to "reflect reasonably" before taking to combat. But by no stretch of the imagination can the "just war" theory be applied to a modern war. Any theory that would tolerate nuclear warfare would be immoral because, by its very nature, nuclear warfare deals death and destruction to whole populations. Who can think of a dispute that could be settled by no other means? . . .

Regardless of what reasons have incited a country to conflict, reflection on the characteristics of war gives some insight into its futility and violence:

Wars escalate within themselves. . . .
Wars brutalize. . . .
Wars incite emotions that overpower reason. . . .
Wars leave behind a legacy of hatred. . . . (*peaceworld*, pp. 43-45)

Dilemma: Arms Control Agreements Encourage Weapons Development

A potential nuclear catastrophe is seen as a possibility by more and more people. Much information is now available on the brutal human costs of the arms race. Contradictions between militarism and democratic values and Christian tradition lead many to oppose and challenge warfare. In spite of all these factors, the arms race continues and the danger remains unabated. Even efforts to limit the arms race through U.S.-U.S.S.R. arms control negotiations have not changed the situation. Johansen describes this situation:

The limits of the present approach to reversing the arms buildup are clear. Military expenditures, destructive capability, and the ability to produce nuclear weapons have expanded dangerously over the past three decades of arms control negotiations. (*Dependable Peace*, p. 3)

In brief, the prevailing approach to arms reductions is failing, as ample evidence demonstrates.

- Total expenditures are enormous.
- They are rising.

33

•The pattern of spending is shifting toward the militarization of the entire planet, whereas previously only the industrialized states purchased large arsenals.

•Despite the decline in the percentage of the world total that is spent by the industrial powers, even the most heavily armed are not decreasing their spending in absolute terms.

These data mean that a vast amount of natural resources, capital, and brainpower is unavailable to meet pressing human needs. In addition, the military-related people and their financial strength together constitute a formidable political force that resists conversion to non-military purposes. This force increases steadily. (*Dependable Peace*, p. 5)

The prevailing approach also has done little to slow the addition of still more advanced weapons to the arsenals of the nuclear-weapons countries (vertical proliferation) or to halt the spread of technology which additional countries may use for acquiring nuclear weapons (horizontal proliferation). Five countries have exploded nuclear devices since the first negotiations on nuclear policy began thirty years ago. Even after more than a decade of nuclear testing, the United States and the Soviet Union could agree to sign a test ban treaty only if it allowed them to test new warheads underground. Such an agreement was achieved in 1963, but countries like China and France, which wanted further atmospheric tests, have refused to sign.

As far as is publicly known, from 1945 until 1977 six governments have exploded a total of 1,081 nuclear devices. More than half of all nuclear tests have occurred since the test ban was signed. The average yearly number of tests during the thirteen years since the treaty is 6⅓ percent *higher* than the average number of tests during the eighteen years of testing before the agreement. Even if a comprehensive test ban, prohibiting all tests, is concluded soon among the United States, Soviet Union, and Britain, this would not prevent other states from conducting tests. (*Dependable Peace*, pp. 10-11)

These excerpts from Robert Johansen's monograph attest to the fact that efforts to contain the arms race, to limit militarism, and to avoid war have been totally unsuccessful and perhaps counterproductive. He claims that the system itself produces the problem. That system he has identified as the "war system" is defined as:

. . . the prevailing set of political, economic and social relationships that are characterized by identification with part of rather than the whole human species and by unreflective loyalties to national political symbols, which together make war, the preparation for war, or the

38/A

> **threat of violence a widely condoned and expected means for settling disputes. (p. 16)**

In spite of these very somber observations, Johansen believes that we are capable of transcending these developments and creating a "peace system" which he defines as one in which:

> **. . . conflict is resolved through nonviolent, political, social, and judicial processes. There are no expectations of war and no national military arsenals. There is a widespread sense of solidarity with the rest of the human species. (p. 16)**

Johansen concedes that in the past there may have been rationales for just wars and positive aspects to the consequences of war. However, he asserts that achieving peace is the major task of our time.

> **The existing war system may have performed certain functions satisfactorily, though at great cost to some, in an earlier age. But given modern technologies, the war system is both unacceptably dangerous and totally unnecessary—unacceptably dangerous because war could be suicidal for much or all of humanity, and totally unnecessary because modern communication, technology, and values could, if properly utilized, support a system that permits only nonviolent means of settling conflicts and of enforcing political decisions. We *could* build that system, but it seems beyond our grasp because of the narrow political perspectives and value commitments within which our societies and their governing officials operate. (p. 15)**

Thus Johansen clearly focuses on the task—a change of values and a change of perspectives. These changes can be achieved only through appropriate education. We need, therefore, to explore in depth the nature of the educational task and to examine and evaluate the potential approaches to achieving education for peace.

For Review, Discussion, and Action

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

1. How do contemporary policies of military preparedness contradict the notions of national security implied in the U.S. Constitution?

2. What important facts about the nation-state should be kept in mind when considering issues of national security?

3. Do you agree with the assertions in the text regarding outmoded assumptions of national security? What dangers are posed by these assumptions?

4. What are the major dangers posed by the arms race?

38/B

5. What is the Christian tradition which should be applied to consideration of the arms race?

6. Why does arms control fail to increase security?

7. What factors indicate a need for a significant change in our global security system?

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

8. What do you believe to be the dominant attitude toward the arms race in your community? On what facts and conditions is your assessment based?

9. What should the schools teach about the arms race and the war system?

10. What learnings will we need to acquire if we are to become able to develop a peace system? What value changes will be required to support a peace system?

11. Is there a need for "disarmament education" as a distinct component of peace education? What might be necessary prerequisite learnings for disarmament education?

WHAT CAN WE DO?

12. Do a study of the impact of military preparedness on your community: percentage of population in service, military activities in the schools, military-related citizens and service organizations, defense-related industry and business, etc. What are the positive contributions to the community? Could these be provided in other ways?

13. Make a list of the war-related holidays, activities, monuments, rituals, and observances which exist in your community. Try to invent peace-related equivalents as alternatives to raise community consciousness about the need for peace. For example, on Veteran's Day or Memorial Day arrange to hold a special screening of one of the films listed in the *War-Peace Film Guide* (see Additional Resources in appendix). Ask that there be special prayers for peace in all churches on these days. Hold a peace vigil.

SESSION

PEACE EDUCATION: TOOLS FOR GLOBAL COMMUNITY BUILDING

Objective: To acquaint participants with the field of peace education, approaches for teaching about problems of peace, and some of the learnings which will be required of all societies if we are to achieve a global peace system.

Contents

☐Peace Education: Definitions and Approaches
☐Purposes and Goals: Overcoming Obstacles to Peace
☐Values Clarification: Essential Skill for Peacemaking
☐Interrelated Problems: Interrelated Learnings
☐Cooperation and Communication: Dealing with Differences
☐Transcending Habit and Culture: Images of Peace
☐For Review, Discussion, and Action

Background Readings

LEVEL I: Resource people and facilitators should read Session Four in this guide and the sections from these Supplementary Resources:

- *peaceworld:* pp. 21-25; 41-45; 71-81; 83-86; 110-116
- *Militarism:* pp. 63-69
- *Dependable Peace:* pp. 13-49

All participants should read Session Four in this guide, paying special attention to the quotes.

LEVEL II: All participants should read the sections listed above in the Supplementary Resources as well as Session Four in this guide. The facilitators should also read the asterisked items in the list of Recommended Readings (see appendix).

LEVEL III: All participants should read Session Four in this guide, the specified sections of the Supplementary Resources, and the Recommended Readings listed in the appendix.

Peace Education: Definitions and Approaches

Peace education is defined in a variety of ways which emphasize the subjects and methods that those stating the definition feel to be most important. The subject matter and teaching methods for peace education are quite varied. They range from "getting to know others" lessons in international understanding to very complex programs based upon a structural analysis of the world economic and political systems. Some include techniques for designing alternative systems for the achievement of peace. This variety makes it possible to introduce peace education into many courses at various grade levels. For this study/action program, peace education is defined as *learning intended to prepare the learners to contribute toward the achievement of peace.*

The most widely used approach is the *international understanding* or the *study of other cultures* approach. Multi-cultural education and education for international understanding emphasize learning about other ethnic groups and nations through study of their cultures and histories. Recently such study has included nations and cultures other than those of European origin.

A second approach is based upon the study of *international relations, world politics,* and/or *global problems.* It is based upon the disciplines of political science and economics adapted to teach appropriate concepts of global economics and politics at different grade levels. Sometimes such courses purport to be "objective" and do not emphasize values and ethical issues. Most do teach decision-making skills as they relate to international affairs. Some involve values clarification regarding crucial global issues. Many courses are taught from national interest or nation-state perspective. Here, too, an encouraging trend is occurring. Growing numbers of such courses are taught from a world interest and a global perspective.

A third field of study emphasizes the problems and concerns of the world's poor in the developing countries, and explores relations between the industrial, or First World, nations and the developing, or Third World nations. *Development education* and/or *third world studies* place great stress on the values of economic equity and social justice as criteria for the development process and for guiding the relations between the industrial and developing nations. Development studies focus frequently on structural violence in the world economic system and usually include study of the New International Economic Order.

Conflict studies is another approach to peace education. It deals with the nature of conflict, patterns of conflict development, approaches to conflict management, avoidance, and resolution. The field has traditionally explored alternatives to violence such as mediation. Now alternative forms of conflict resolution at the international level are increasingly emphasized, including a search for possible substitutes to the war system. Some offer

instruction in the rationale for and skills of non-violent conflict resolution. In some few cases, the theory and philosophy of non-violence are also included. The history of non-violence, as well as its theory and practice, is offered as a separate course, particularly in church-related institutions.

World order studies is a comprehensive approach to peace education which includes aspects of all the foregoing. In its early stages of development, this approach emphasized structural and systemic questions related to conflict resolution, peacekeeping, and security. More recently, it has included social and economic aspects of the problems of peace and justice, with special emphasis on human rights issues. World order studies is an explicitly value-based approach to peace education which advocates teaching knowledge and skills needed for the realization of five world order values: peace, economic equity, social justice, ecological balance, and political participation.

Programs which are called *peace studies* are usually value-explicit and ethical in their approaches to issues and to the analysis and resolution of problems. Peace studies programs frequently include the same subject matter treated in other approaches. Usually more emphasis is placed on the ethical and moral questions involved. Some topics frequently treated in peace studies courses, more than in others, are human rights, liberation movements, structural violence, poverty, colonialism, racism and other forms of oppression, and issues related to war, nuclear weapons, the arms race and disarmament. Most program designs and curriculum development are the work of private groups and individual classroom teachers and study group leaders. A few have been developed by public systems, such as that in New York State. Programs designed by Christian denominations fall largely into this category and are frequently called "Education for Peace and Justice." Many such programs are included in religious education provided by congregations and in church-related schools.

Lack of peace education in our schools and churches is not for lack of teaching approaches or materials. Advocates of each of the approaches described have developed a variety of teaching units including printed material and audio-visual aids. Consultants and teacher training services are available. Further reference will be made to these materials and services in Sessions Five and Six. What is needed are informed people in communities and congregations who will require that the schools and churches offer appropriate courses, units, and programs in peace education. Many more people than currently do need to know and use the basics of peacemaking.

Purposes and Goals: Overcoming Obstacles to Peace

The concept of peace education used in classifying these approaches is an education to provide knowledge and skills, as well as capacities and

commitment, to overcome obstacles to peace, and to build a global community which encompasses the entire human family and accords equal value and full dignity to all human beings. Some describe the goal of peace education as a "humane world society" or a "human world order." Various terms are used; all have a similar vision which is the global realization of what many Christians call the "beloved community."

A fundamental commonality of all these goals for peace education is the social conditions which are sought. "Community" is understood as a society based on trust and dedicated to the equitable sharing of all benefits among all members. Public policies in an authentic community are derived from a common commitnemt to shared values, be they "humanist" values, "world order" values, Christian values, or other values. All such values are rooted in the respect for the dignity of the human person and are sought through the development of a truly secure and peaceful community.

Another way of stating the purpose of peace education might be "education for authentic security." Most peace educators believe that true security can only be found in community. The achievement of security and community requires an understanding of the major obstacles to peace and barriers against security.

Each of the Supplementary Resources emphasizes several of the major obstacles to peace and security which peace researchers and educators have designated as topics of central concern. The purpose of peace education and peace research is to build a body of knowledge on which to base education and public policy directed toward the achievement of peace. Some of the Recommended Readings have been developed by peace researchers in collaboration with peace educators.

The obstacles identified in the Supplementary Readings include some major problems which we must learn to understand if we are to become effective peacemakers. Among the problems are national and individual behaviors conditioned by narrowly defined national and self-interests, the widespread violation of human dignity by the structures of violence which characterize the present world system, and the fallacious value priorities which permit the frustration of basic human needs.

Narrow self-interest, the urge to be "Number One," is one of the obstacles which raises moral and ethical issues for Christians committed to educate for peace. Michael McIntyre, in *peaceworld*, describes that obstacle in these words:

> **. . . particular nations and groups justify putting their interests ahead of those of the rest of the human family. This kind of unfairness in human relationships retards the self-development and human fulfillment of the world's family. It is understandable why some nations and groups work for their own self-interests. But it is**

not so understandable why the advantages of the stronger nations must be protected most often by the use of force and by the constant accumulation of power. To be on "top of the heap" requires enormous effort and the diversion of other energies into this one task. (p. 21)

The reality is that in every age, temptations will be made to vanity and pride, to the deep longing for authority and control, to the hunger for security and well-being and to the search for personal power. All of us will be made offers we seemingly can't refuse and we can expect to be regarded every bit as passive and out of step as Jesus if we say no. For it is part of the nature of our time that we expect our system, just as others in the other developed nations expect theirs, to deliver these political advantages to us intact, on a regular basis. The advertising to which we are constantly exposed carries this message. (p. 22-23)

We are now left with one choice—the "real, human agenda." At present, it is not the preservation of U.S. security, power and authority at the expense of the rest of the world; nor is it the establishment of the security, authority and power of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; nor is it even the guaranteeing of the security, authority and power of all the developed nations as over against the rest of the world. The real, human agenda lies in working out with the pulsing, suffering human family the common hope for our common future. (p. 24)

As we look at the way in which the interests of particular nations and groups frequently are extended in favor of the interests of all, we can see that one of the elements in the mission of building peace is for us to be clear about false promises of political power and not to be confused by anything less than the real, human agenda which stands beyond our personal advantage and which stands within God's promise that the weak will not be sent, empty, away. (p. 25)

Clearly, one of the lessons we must learn through peace education is how to grapple with the ethical and moral choices inherent in the political issues with which we, as citizens of a powerful nation, are faced. Another important lesson should be how to redefine our own self- and national interests in terms of the "real, human agenda."

We must also learn to understand violence and its human consequences. In particular, we must learn about that form of violence which stems from the way our society is organized. That form is made most clear in the following passages by Sister Luke Tobin in *peaceworld*. Categories of violence are described in a way that could be useful in a classroom lesson plan.

Perhaps it would be helpful to examine some of the ways in which this violation of personhood takes place. Professor Newton Garver has developed a continuum along which we may position four manifestations of violence: (*The citation for the continuum is given as Robert McAfee Brown*, Religion and Violence, *Westminster Press, 1973.)*

1. The clearest instance of violence is, of course, personal overt physical assault in which one person does physical harm to another.
2. When overt physical assault is practiced in corporate terms, it becomes institutionalized overt physical assault. The clearest example is war.
3. Personal covert violence takes place when one individual violates the personhood of another in ways that are psychologically destructive rather than physically harmful.
4. Personal covert violence can become institutionalized covert violence. This occurs when the institutions or structures of society violate the personhood of society's members. (p. 42-43)

The kind of learning we need to confront these issues is "consciousness raising." If we are to transcend these structures and avoid such violations of personhood, we must become aware of the violence inherent in these structures. We must come to recognize our own part in maintaining them. We must become conscious of the ways in which the structures are doing violence to the values we hold as Christians and as citizens of a democratic society dedicated to the pursuit of justice. Values clarification is fundamental to peace education.

Values Clarification: Essential Skill for Peacemaking

In *peaceworld*, Sister Luke Tobin writes of values and choosing values:

> **What is value? It is a reality at the very center of a person's existence which is basically and uniquely one's own and affects one's behavior, shapes one's ideas and conditions one's feelings. As such, it is a life stance which a person has freely chosen from alternatives and has acted upon, and which the individual celebrates as being part of the creative integration of one's development as a person. One's values are continually developing. They can never be static, but must constantly be rechosen as the person continues to grow. As a person grows in identity and interdependency, he/she is continually choosing values and fashioning his/her hierarchy of values. (p. 72)**

Tobin draws from the work of Raths, Harmin, and Simon in *Values and Teaching*, (Charles Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, OH, 1966) for a description of a true value and the process of valuing. Their definition is that to be a value, seven criteria are necessary:

CHOOSING:	1) freely chosen 2) from alternatives 3) after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative
PRIZING:	4) cherishing, being happy with the choice 5) willing to affirm the choice publicly
ACTING:	6) doing something with the choice 7) repeatedly, in some pattern of life

Those processes collectively define valuing. Results of the valuing process are called values.

Tobin then moves to value clarification:

> **Value clarification is a methodology or process by which a person is helped to discover one's values through behavior, through feelings, through ideas—what important choices one has made. To live on a set of values assimilated from one's upbringing rather than chosen is to move in directions and to have goals that are hidden from oneself of which one is not aware. It is only as one, as an adult, clarifies what choices have a major influence on one's personality, that one can really understand who one is and where one is going.**
>
> **Realizing that hope for the future lies in the young people who will soon be the decision-makers holding the world's destiny in their power, one comes to hope that the value systems they are forming are directed toward peace. How can children and youth learn to become creative, nonviolent social agents in a complex world if they are not forming sound values based on peaceful priorities? (p. 73)**

This model for values clarification can be used in studying the problems of achieving authentic human security. It makes evident the need for skills and knowledge which will enable us to know of and understand the alternative possibilities for pursuing security. Also needed is the capacity to analyze the potential effectiveness of the alternatives and to evaluate the consequences which the alternatives hold for the realization or frustration of our values.

Alternative policies in the area of national security do exist. They range from the present arms race which is rapidly militarizing our planet to schemes for general and complete disarmament, including totally nonviolent security systems. Each of the alternatives represents different assumptions about the causes of violence and the denial of needs fulfillment. Each also reflects different value priorities. Most important,

each represents a value choice. Without choice, neither real valuing nor a democratic process are possible. *Alternative possibilities for public policy are not only essential to the formation of a healthy system of social values, they are the foundation of democratic decision-making.* Making such possibilities for peace and security known is a major task of peace education. Action to overcome values frustration and achieve needs fulfillment depends upon knowing what is possible.

Interrelated Problems: Interrelated Learnings

The causes of the frustration of our Christian values coincide with those which underlie the lack of fulfillment of basic human needs. The interrelationships among the problems which give rise to and manifest those causes should form significant content in peace education. One frustration of human needs fulfillment and how it relates to other global problems is described by Hazel Johns in *peaceworld*:

> **Food is one of the most basic human needs. In Burma the greeting is still: "Have you eaten?" For Egyptians, bread is called *aish* which means "life." Food is like atomic power. It can be used for peaceful purposes or it can be used as a weapon. When used in the latter manner, it works against peace. A lack of adequate food reserves makes a nation more insecure than a lack of guns. Insecure nations are easily frightened into actions that offset the peace of the world. This gives food an international input to a degree hardly understood in North America, where it has always existed in abundance and where the distribution of its surpluses has contributed further to the instability between nations.**
>
> **The food crisis is inextricably linked to population, the environment and energy, as well as to economic issues and political powers. As someone said: "The Arabs have crude, but the Americans have food." With this enormously powerful weapon in its hands, the U.S. can help construct or destroy the world's delicate system of international bargaining. (p. 84-85)**

The wealth and power of the United States affect the lives of millions throughout the world. Therefore, the success of a global peace and security political movement may well depend on citizens of the U.S. Some of what we must learn if we are to fulfill our unique and critical responsibility for world security is stated in the following, written by Johns. It comprises a list of learning goals for us and demonstrates how learnings, like the problems, are interrelated:

> **How does one change? In step order:**
>
> **1) understand the problems in one's country that affect or are affected by other peoples;**

2) understand some of the greatest threats to civilization or world order, such as nuclear holocaust, economic injustices, starvation and environment, inflation;

3) get the best people in seats of power, who would then be aware of the thinking from people at all levels;

4) understand the attitudes of others; and

5) ask what justice means in an interdependent world. (p. 115-116)

One of the major learnings necessary for us to build a world community is that our destinies are inextricably intertwined with the destinies of all other peoples of the world. The human interest is an interdependent interest toward which all of us must contribute.

We need to transcend our present narrow concept of "national security." The process of militarization which derives from that narrow concept must be reversed. Our approach to security issues must include consideration of all the interrelated problems and the values dilemmas raised.

The World Council of Churches asserts that the Christian community has a special responsibility in this area. Its statement on the subject reflects both the interrelatedness of issues and the interrelatedness of people—those in the U.S. and all other nations, Christians and all other faiths. We must learn to cooperate and collaborate for the achievement of our common security.

The church has a prophetic task to denounce both the structures of injustice which promote and sustain militarism in the world, and those who misuse the power they have acquired to maintain those structures.

But that task must go beyond mere denunciation to participation in the realization of the New Creation. The church must be bold enough to imagine new forms of struggles against the evils of militarism, and new alternatives to replace the perverse options for "national security" and peace offered to us by a militaristic system. We must imagine ways to provide the establishment of justice for all as a means to replace reliance upon arms. We must envision a future in which national security is seen in terms, not of the maintenance of the privileges of the few, but in the equal distribution of wealth and power in society.

In this renewed struggle and vision of a new society for which we labor, there is no place for a militarism which claims to defend the "true faith"; there is no theological justification for the distorted concepts of "national security" which are spreading through much of the world; there is no place for trade in arms or in techniques of repression. This is a search which must engage all the resources of

> the Christian community: men *and* women, old *and* young, the ordained *and* the laity, technical experts *and* those whose expertise resides in the experience of having suffered the consequences of militarism. We do not engage in this task as an isolated community in the world, but together with all people who share our desire for justice, the people of other faiths and ideologies in each of our nations.
>
> Within the Christian church we recognize that we have nurtured, and in some places continue to nurture, ideas and institutions which either promote or condone the growth of militarism. These we hope to help eliminate, together with those in all our churches who we know share our concern and commitment. (*Militarism*, pp. 65-66)

Cooperation and Communication: Dealing with Differences

From the foregoing we can deduce another learning which must be pursued by people and societies educating themselves for peace. We are called to engage in this pursuit of learning with "people of other faiths and ideologies." To do this, we must learn to communicate adequately and accurately with those who see the world from different perspectives or who hold different sets of values. This is especially true in relation to those who have placed a different priority on common values, as in the case of people in the U.S. who differ over modes to achieve national security.

Such learning might be pursued through the special emphasis on developing a dialogue for the exploration of conflicting ideas. Those engaging in such dialogue and debate might first compare the awarenesses of each, identifying the specific differences in world view and values. Then they might pursue a compatible form of analysis which would enable them to search out the causes for the differences. The nature of the value differences could be clarified. Where possible, common values related to peace and justice might be jointly pursued. Identification of such common values is essential to the initiation of a global movement for peace and justice arising from concerted, cooperative action among many different groups throughout the world.

An effective movement will depend on deriving a *common awareness* and clarification of *common values*. An even more difficult task in constructive communication, particularly with those of other ideologies, is the elaboration of *compatible analyses* of the causes of the problems. Differences over the causes may be as difficult to resolve as transcending certain cultural differences which impede communication. However, those committed to human survival will set themselves to the task of

learning to communicate even through these seemingly impenetrable barriers of conflicting values. Peace and security do not depend on total agreement on all issues and analyses. They do depend on communication skills which can transcend the disagreements in the planning of *coordinated actions* toward the achievement of the *common goal*.

Mastery of this sequence—from coming to a common awareness to arriving at the common goal, even with our adversaries and opponents—may not be the most difficult learning of all. What may be is the need to change the very roots and foundations of human behavior, social institutions, habits, and culture. Yet human beings have done this many times in the past. Without such changes we would not have survived through these many centuries. Without such in the future we may not survive this century. We must pursue these changes as we build the global movement. Both of these tasks are dependent upon education.

Transcending Habit and Culture: Images of Peace

The urgency of these tasks lies in the fact that the continuation of war and injustice is largely the result of obsolete habits and culture. In *Dependable Peace*, Johansen uses these words to articulate this reality:

> **The perspectives and attitudes that prevent the creation of a more desirable security system are learned—they are not innate or determined by human nature. If learned, they can be changed. Yet we, and the institutions we have created, tend to behave as changeless creatures of habit. Faced with new technologies of warfare and more interdependent social relations, old habits that once made sense no longer do so. Historically, civilizations have collapsed when unable to change fast enough to adapt to new conditions. Today old diplomatic habits practiced within the existing international system do not take account of new conditions. As a result, lengthy negotiations fail to halt the arms race, leaving many people of good-will both frustrated and puzzled by the lack of results. (p. 16)**
>
> **If one genuinely wants to reverse the arms buildup, one must make a commitment to fundamental changes that will enable one to break the military habit completely. This means a decision at the outset to work for abolishing both national military arsenals and the war system which brought them into being. Without that commitment for abolition, selected weapons systems may come and go, as arms control agreements rise and fall, but recurring buildups of arms, like the craving for a fix by an addict, will always return. (p. 17)**
>
> **To expect the world's most powerful governments, without outside pressure, to build a new security system where those states now militarily weak would gain influence relative to the states now**

militarily strong, is like expecting a divine right king to lead the revolution for democracy and for abolition of the throne. We may hope that it will happen, but we would be foolish to wait for it. Yet the necessary changes *can* occur if enough people *insist* that they should.

The single most difficult task in creating a security system appropriate for our time is convincing people to join a movement that aims to abolish war. . . . (p. 20-21)

. . . If widespread education and attitudinal change are stimulated by a global social movement, the limits of the possible could widen sufficiently to achieve a new system with the following characteristics:

1. All nations are protected against the threat or use of violence by any other nation.

2. Such protection can be guaranteed in part because the production and the possession of all military weapons are prohibited. (Law-enforcement equipment necessary for the maintenance of domestic tranquility is, of course, not prohibited.) Extremely hazardous non-weapons materials, such as fissionable substances, are also strictly regulated according to universally applied rules.

3. A world security organization functions with the power to enforce the rules against the possession of weapons or the misuse of fissionable materials. It presides over enforcement activities of a transnational police force and administers the arms-reducing process in its final stages. Officials acting on its behalf have the authority to prevent weapons violations anywhere in the world. The organization, operating within a system of checks and balances to insure accountability, is responsible to a global assembly.

4. A global monitoring agency inspects for violations of weapons prohibitions. Information regarding possible violations can be given directly to the agency by any citizen of any country.

5. Countries are required to settle disputes through nonviolent political, social, or judicial processes.

6. A standing, individually recruited transnational police or peace force enforces the globally established rules for war prevention.

7. The diversion of resources from the manufacture of military equipment into the production of food and the abolition of poverty enables more families on earth to have adequate nourishment and shelter. (p. 25-26)

. . . Until there has been widespread attitudinal change, there would be insufficient political support for a humane implementation of the desired changes in institutions, even in the unlikely event that one could capture power.

> If concerned individuals and groups make intense efforts to educate and organize for a demilitarized planet, it might be possible within the next twenty-five years to have a process well underway to abolish the war system. . . .(p. 29)

The World Council of Churches called for the church to "imagine new forms of struggle . . . ways to provide for the establishment of justice." It sees Christians as engaging in struggle to achieve a vision of a new society. Without such a vision it is unlikely that we can break old habits. Learning to envision and imagine new systems is an important objective of peace education. Johansen has demonstrated that such visions and images can be formed.

Johansen also offers some ideas on the more difficult aspect of achieving a true peace system, formulating the political strategies and actions which could bring that system into being. He suggests transition steps which could lead us to achievement of the preferred system. He also emphasizes the importance of the educative process which would bring about the attitudinal change so essential to starting the process.

> At the outset, persons interested in building planetary community will seek to enlist and energize existing religious and civic organizations for study and political action. Inspired by a heightened sense of human solidarity, people in this modern abolitionist movement will commit themselves to replacing the institutions of war with a new system of peace. They will build a broad coalition to bring the question of major arms reductions to the top of the nation's political agenda. Farsighted and morally sensitive persons now in the ranks of youth groups, environmentalists, feminists, civil rights workers, peace activists, labor leaders, business people, farm workers, churches and synagogues, political parties, and professional organizations will all be involved.
>
> Members will first encourage people to begin thinking about a new image of security. The old idea is that security depends upon military prowess and a government's ability to protect a given piece of *territory*. The new image of security will emphasize the well-being of the world's *people* and the *planet*. Planetary citizens will promote public debate centered on the idea that serving the needs of humanity, not merely of nation or class, should become a principal standard for making decisions. The security of the human race, for example, is related as much to ozone density or to a dependable supply of food and energy as to control over a national segment of territory. Because of the broader, more humane image of security, the movement will seek to implement the following four values as an expression of the global human interest: peace without national

military arsenals, economic well-being for all, basic human rights and social justice, and ecological balance. (p. 32)

Johansen's contributions are useful in deriving a basic model of learning processes and objectives for peace education. The quotes from his pamphlet can be viewed as a kind of synthesis of the learning objectives suggested by the quotes from the other Supplementary Readings. Most important, he provides an example of the kind of imaginative and committed energies which should be applied to the problem. He actually envisions and describes an alternative and then offers concrete possible policies for bringing it about. In this, he shows us the creativity and commitment for which we should be striving in peace education programs if we are to educate for achievement of the new reality.

He also provides a pattern for integrating the learning objectives suggested by others:

—the points at which the ethical and moral issues should be examined;

—aspects required for an adequate definition of security and human interest;

—an analysis of the structures which impose violence and impede peace;

—a comprehensive understanding of the frustration of basic human needs;

—the interrelationship of various global problems;

—the mobilizing of a global movement to transcend the problems.

Most important, he spells out for us just what it will take to develop a truly adequate concept of national security in a global era.

Johansen makes a significant contribution when he states a set of world order values as the goals to be achieved by an alternative security system. These values and the skills needed to realize them provide a useful conceptual structure and basis for the formulation of learning objectives for peace studies programs.

Learning objectives need to be further specified in terms of particular attitudes, skills, and knowledge. For that task, these values provide a comprehensive framework within which to organize those objectives. Some world order values advocates insist on five values rather than the four which Johansen has listed. To 1) peace without national military arsenals, 2) economic well-being for all, 3) basic human rights and social justice, and 4) ecological balance, some add 5) political participation. Many people believe that it will be only through the full and vigorous participation of all committed people that we can achieve the peace system that we seek.

Preparing citizens to participate in the politics of peacemaking is a major task of peace education. Sharing in the struggle is as important to the creation of community as sharing the benefits is to the maintenance of

community. Through participation in the process, effective lessons in creation and maintenance are learned.

Creation and maintenance of authentic community and security is an ongoing participatory process. It is lifelong for the truly peaceful society as learning is for the truly educated person. Both processes take place within all arenas of human experience. Both are consciously constructed and based on the values of the society and the purposes of the educational system.

In the next session, we will be dealing with learning objectives for peacemaking within the formal educational system in order to provide our youth with the attitudes and skills required for effective use of the tools for building global community.

For Review, Discussion, and Action

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

1. Review the approaches to peace education described in the beginning of this session. Are there approaches not described here which might be more effective in achieving the purposes of peace education? Add them to the list of possibilities to consider when you plan your program.

2. What does the text assert to be the main obstacles to peace? How do these assertions compare to your previous assumptions about such obstacles? Are these assertions well argued? Can you think of counter arguments?

3. Does the model of values clarification described on page 43 seem to you to be useful for application to the issues raised by the main obstacles to peace?

4. Review the example of interrelationships among global issues on page 44 and apply it to a problem other than food, such as energy or ecology. Does the interrelated approach offer an effective means to understanding security issues?

5. What does the text suggest are the necessary elements for cooperation with those who have a different world view or who hold different opinions on security issues? Could you establish these elements in relating to a particular group or person with whom you differ?

6. Compare the characteristics of a peace system described or implied in the statement by Johansen on page 47 with those in the National Council of Churches statement.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

7. Which approach to peace education would you prefer for your own children? What values influence your preference? Which approach do

you believe would be most likely to work in your local schools? What community values and conditions lead you to make that judgment? If a variety of approaches were to be recommended, at what grade levels and in what courses might you include the varying approaches?

8. Some of the text implies, and various peace educators have asserted, that peace education is a form of political education. What should be the purposes and objectives of political education? How do these relate to the purposes and objectives of peace education? Does this element of politics raise a value dilemma for Christians? For anyone in your study group? If so, how might it be resolved?

9. Johansen suggests that peace can be achieved only through a mass mobilization of citizens and a widespread public education effort. The World Council of Churches asserts that the Christian church has a special role to play in such a movement. Do you agree with these assertions? If not, what alternatives can you offer? If so, how could your community fit into the movement? What role would be desirable for your church, for your schools? What roles would be possible for them to play now? Will changes be necessary in each or both to enable them to play these roles?

WHAT CAN WE DO?

10. See if your state board of education has issued a statement on peace and/or global education. Inquire into statements on peace and peace education issued by your denomination. Distribute these statements to the group and decide how they can be used to gain support for your efforts in peace education.

11. Conduct a curriculum survey of the church-related education programs and the public schools to find out if any of the approaches to peace education are employed. Gather a list of peace education materials used in your schools and churches. This survey can be a cooperative effort among the group, dividing up the research church by church and grade by grade. You can interview students and teachers and review text books and other curriculum materials. It may be best to start with informal conversation with your own children and acquaintances in the educational system or congregation.

SESSION 5

THE GOALS OF PEACE EDUCATION: LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Objective: To outline what we should teach our children and youth to prepare them to be peacemakers and community builders; to propose a set of learning objectives to be embraced by our schools so they will be contributing agents to the movement for an appropriate security system.

Contents

- ☐Learning Objectives for Peace Education
- ☐People-Related Objectives
- ☐Problem-Related Objectives
- ☐Recent Stages in the History of Peace Education
- ☐The Next Stage in Peace Education
- ☐For Review, Discussion, and Action

Background Readings

LEVEL I: Resource people and facilitators should read the "Final Document of the World Congress on Disarmament Education" (UNESCO, 1980), "Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace, and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms." (See Supplementary Resources in appendix.) All participants should read Session Five of this guide, paying particular attention to the specific learning objectives.

LEVEL II: All participants should read Session Five in this guide and the materials specified above for the resource people and facilitators. The facilitators should also read the asterisked items in the list of Recommended Readings (see appendix).

LEVEL III: All participants should read Session Five in this guide, the resources recommended above, and the Recommended Readings listed in the appendix.

Learning Objectives for Peace Education

Planning for any learning process must begin with the statement of particular objectives stemming from the underlying educational purposes of the process. Such objectives are used to plan the learning process and to evaluate it. For instance, objectives for peace education might be used as a preliminary assessment of the capacity of any curriculum, educational material, school system or other learning environment to provide appropriate peace education. The objectives stated in this session are intended to help you facilitate the planning and evaluation of peace education in your own school system and community learning environments. They can also be an aid in assessing the capacity of your schools to achieve the purposes embodied in peace education objectives.

These objectives are neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other sets of objectives different from these have been stated by various peace education agencies. These particular objectives are based on the assumptions, assertions, and values which have formed the basis of the discussions in the first four sessions of this learning program.

The principal guiding values are the five world order values described in Session Four on page 50. The basic assumption is that fundamental structural changes must take place in the international system to achieve true security, assure peace, and bring justice. Such structural changes will not be possible unless changes occur in the behavior of the human family, in the value priorities among nation-states, and in the perceptions of citizens and political leaders of the nature of true security. Such changes in behavior, priorities, and perceptions could result from the development of certain *personal capacities* and the acquisition of particular *factual knowledge*. The specific learning objectives have, therefore, been categorized into two general areas: "people-related objectives," comprising personal capacities, and "problem-related objectives," concerned with factual knowledge.

These objectives are not stated as they would be for an audience of professional educators. They are presented in a form which should be useful for all concerned people but which also can be related to formal curriculum planning. The pursuit of these objectives can be integrated into the planning of education at all levels and in all learning environments. Some peace educators assert that such objectives should inform the content of all materials and influence the methods chosen for teaching all subjects at all levels. They should be a significant component of teacher training, both pre-service and in-service. All teachers should be aware of the need for, purposes of, and approaches to peace education. Your church might be of special service to the cause of peace by providing such educational opportunities for teachers.

In developing objectives for a particular educational experience, it is important to keep in mind the levels of moral and cognitive development of the people involved. Some peace educators and others with a particular concern to be shared sometimes "lay on" concepts in ways that are not appropriate to the developmental level of the learners. Laying on more than people can handle can have a reverse effect. Peace educators should be sensitive to the needs and capacities of learners.

People-Related Objectives

This category of objectives is intended to develop an understanding of self and others which will enable the learner to become an effective peacemaker. It comprises capacities which will enable persons and societies to guide human relations in a manner more conducive to peace and justice.

OBJECTIVE 1: Development of a positive self-image and a sense of specific personal identity complemented by a sense of general human identity.

A positive self-image is essential for a person to be a constructive actor in the social system and to relate constructively to other people. Every child should be helped to develop such a sense of self, as well as a sense of personal identity which is based on pride in one's ethnic and family origins while according honor and respect to other ethnic groups and families. This sense of honor and respect derives from a general human identity which enables individuals to think of themselves as part of the entire human family rather than simply as a member of an exclusive component of that human family, i.e., a nation-state, a religion, or any of the specific categories of identity which divide people.

OBJECTIVE 2: Tolerance of human weaknesses in self and others and willingness to try to overcome such weaknesses in a positive, constructive spirit.

As a part of the process of developing positive concepts of self and others, children should learn to understand that all human beings have weaknesses and make mistakes. All of us are capable of causing harm and hurt to others as individuals and as groups. For constructive human relations and a peaceful society, we must develop in our children and youth the capacity to forgive and to understand the nature of weakness and error. Forgiveness is not only a Christian virtue; it is an essential quality for building peace. Forgiveness of self is essential so that energies may be concentrated on development and maturation rather than on compensation for faults and weaknesses.

OBJECTIVE 3: Appreciation of human diversity and affirmation of strengths and positive characteristics in self and others.

The kind of atmosphere in which peacekeeping and community are possible is one in which individuals feel good about themselves and others and are able to understand and tolerate human weaknesses and errors. To create this kind of atmosphere, children need to develop a sense of appreciation of the strengths and positive characteristics of self and others. It is important that they learn that individual people and ethnic groups express positive characteristics in very different and varied ways, providing a rich cultural and behavioral repertoire for the human family. Individual and cultural differences should be seen as enriching rather than being used as a basis for exclusion, discrimination, or conflict.

OBJECTIVE 4: Sense of responsibility for the welfare of self and others.

A sense of responsibility includes self-reliance or the ability to care for one's self and to contribute to the well-being of one's group. It also involves the capacity not only to tolerate error and mistakes but to take responsibility for their correction. Taking responsibility for self and society means helping to provide for the fulfillment of the needs of self and others. It also means taking responsibility for removing the causes of error in self, in others, and in the structures of society.

OBJECTIVE 5: Capacity to trust in one's self and others.

One of the obstacles to disarmament and achieving lasting peace is lack of trust among persons and nations. Trust is essential to the creation of peaceful relationships. A sense of trust in one's self comes from knowing one's own weaknesses as well as strenghts, and in coming to believe in the human capacity to overcome weaknesses and errors. Children should be taught that as they can develop these capacities, so can others. They should be helped to see that in any given situation it may be necessary in the interest of peace for one or all parties involved in a conflict to change. For this to happen, they need to know that all persons and groups are capable of such change and that it is possible to trust people to change and to fulfill their obligations.

OBJECTIVE 6: Commitment to the equal value of persons and the fulfillment of universal human rights.

It was stated above that children need to learn that all people, including themselves, have strengths and weaknesses and that diversity is an enriching fact of life. They should also learn that all people have the same fundamental human needs and have equal right to expect the fulfillment of these needs. This concept of universal human rights and a commitment to their fulfillment is a significant objective to be developed by peace education. Such a commitment is more likely when children are taught that all persons, no matter how different they are from each other, are of

equal human value. Equality does not refer to uniformity or sameness. Rather it means the universality of humanness, the uniqueness of personhood, and the dignity inherent in all human beings.

These first six objectives deal with universality and uniqueness, concepts which are complex and will likely take many years to teach. They must be taught in many forms through the years and with different content. Living by these concepts is essential to achieve the universal taboo against all murder, even that sanctioned as war. That taboo is a necessary basis for universal human security and makes it possible to know that we will not be murdered by the state—our own or that of the enemy.

As the commitment to fulfillment of universal human rights is developed, children should be taught the facts of prejudice and discrimination. They can be made sensitive to racism, sexism, colonialism, and any forms of discrimination which systematically deny the rights of many in the human family. It is also important to help children understand that even those with whom they disagree or who hold very different values and world views are people of equal value. This point is made very clearly by Pope John XXIII in his encyclical, *Pacem In Terris* (Paulist Press, 1963), in which he points out that even those who are in grave error are still human beings entitled to all human rights. It is important for Christians to understand this point, not only in terms of theological differences but also in terms of the ideological and political differences which threaten the peace of the world and cause deep divisions in our nation over issues of national security.

OBJECTIVE 7: Understanding of change and conflict as ever-present parts of the human experience.

Children need to learn to respond positively and constructively to the challenge of a changing world full of conflict. They must understand that change and conflict in society are as much a part of life as the physical and mental changes of human growth and maturation and the everyday differences and disputes with friends and family. They can learn that whether change and conflict produce positive or negative results depends on how those involved respond.

OBJECTIVE 8: Capacity to face change and conflict in a direct and constructive manner.

Specific conflict management skills can be taught. Children can learn to respond constructively to various forms and levels of conflict from interpersonal through international relationships. If we expect the development of responsible attitudes toward conflict, we must provide the tools for carrying out responsibly the fundamental skills which provide both the ability and the readiness to deal with conflict.

OBJECTIVE 9: Capacity to recognize and clarify one's own values and understand those of others.

Individually held personal values and world views influence social attitudes and political positions. Ethical behavior comprises consistency between personal values and social and political ones. Some people separate their personal morality from their political position or their private from their public behavior. This dichotomy is in large measure responsible for our willingness to tolerate war and injustice. Adults as well as children need to learn these lessons.

We need to "pass on" to our children the Christian values which uphold peace and justice. They also need instruction in clarifying the origins, assumptions, and ultimate meanings behind those values. Knowing how these values relate to what adults personally believe and publicly stand for is important. We need to provide children and ourselves with the capacities to understand the values of others, both cultural and personal, as a step in transcending differences and initiating cooperation.

OBJECTIVE 10: Capacity to accommodate differences and build cooperative relationships with others who are culturally and ideologically different from us.

The "Spaceship Earth" metaphor makes it clear that conflict and differences cannot be accepted as obstacles to cooperation. As we engage in values clarification and analysis of social, political, and economic conflict, it becomes evident that in spite of the universality of humanness and human needs, deep and fundamental differences exist within the human family. Cultural and racial differences are frequently accepted as a basis for violent conflict. National differences and competition have been similarly accepted. Comparatively small areas of the planet, such as Europe, have been torn by "tribal wars."

Some of the deep differences today are ideological and economic ones. These have been described in political or geographic terms such as "communism vs. democracy," or "the free world vs. the slave states," or "North vs. South," or "Third World vs. First World." These differences have been used as an excuse for the lethally accelerating arms race among the "superpowers." Similar reasons are given for the continued armed struggle between those referred to as "liberation movements" or "terrorists" and the established rulers in the developing world.

However, should these races or struggles esaclate to the point where the ultimate weapons are used, they could destroy the human family and the planet Earth. Peace might have formerly been considered an "ethical principle," but now it has become a "survival imperative." Respect for the humanness and fundamental rights of our enemies and opponents is a requisite for avoiding an ultimate holocaust. Such respect

is also a basic underpinning of cooperation for mutual security and survival.

Even very young children can learn to cooperate with "sibling rivals" and with various "others." The others in their world may be people of different races, religions, social classes. They might be new immigrants to the community. In the process of providing these lessons, adults should also instruct themselves in these truths. They can practice bridging gaps between "the Soviets and the West," "the hawks and the doves," "the liberals and the conservatives." We all need to learn that we can no longer play a win-lose game. We all win or we all lose.

OBJECTIVE 11: Capacity to struggle for the changes in self and society that will make it possible to redefine both personal and social goals to achieve peace and justice.

If we are to be successful in attempts to cooperate with those with whom we differ, many of us will have to change some of our basic attitudes and behaviors. In addition, we will have to struggle for changes in policies and structures. The changes in ourselves will be most difficult. We have been taught that our growth and learning process is limited. We "grow up" and "become adults." We "graduate" from school. We develop a fixed set of beliefs and values which comprise our "personal security system." When those beliefs and values are challenged or undermined, we become "insecure" and "defensive." Facing such challenges involves risk, but like the risks of changing our approach to "national security," the consequences of leaving obsolete beliefs in place pose a far greater "security risk." We need to help ourselves and others to accept personal change, intellectual and spiritual growth, as lifelong processes which require energy and commitment. Positive changes don't "just happen" to us, any more than they "just happen" in society. They require struggle.

We need to prepare our children to engage in their own maturation process and to pursue continued growth and lifelong learning. They need to learn the ability to assess and reassess their personal needs and goals in light of the needs and goals of the entire human family. Such goals as "the good life" and "national power" need to be constantly redefined in terms of their effects on the rest of the world. "Risk" and "sacrifice" are skills that must be learned in order to achieve peace and justice.

OBJECTIVE 12: Commitment to justice and fairness as fundamental criteria for decision making and policy making.

Unless we "live peace," we cannot ourselves become instruments of peace nor teach our children and youth to do so. The peace movement and peace education have been developing concrete ways to "live peace." A first step is commitment to the fundamental principles of peace and justice. These principles call us to find specific ways to exercise justice and fairness in making our personal decisions and formulating the positions

on which to base our political actions. To Christians this means application of the basic premises of Christianity to social and political life. A growing number of denominations over the past few years have made official statements on, or given priority to, disarmament, peace, and justice. Write to United Ministries in Education for information about publication of these statements.

The principles of peace and justice must also be applied to public policy matters, especially in regard to national and human security. Many peace researchers and activists are producing sound analyses and statements applying humanistic and/or Christian principles to issues of national security and the arms race. Such an analysis appears in *The National Interest and the Human Interest*, by Robert Johansen (Princeton University Press, 1980).

These statements and the growth of the Christian peace movement are evidence that the achievement of this learning goal is possible.

Summary of People-Related Learning Objectives

These people-related learning objectives could be described as spelling out in educational terms the capacities and abilities that Christians seek to develop in order to "love thy neighbor as thyself." Ethical abstractions can be transposed into learning processes and actual experience for learners of all ages.

Problem-Related Objectives

The people-related objectives were based on what we hope learners will become, the kind of people they will be, and how they will relate to others. The problem-related objectives are based on what we believe people should know and what we hope they will do. Educators sometimes refer to these as "competencies" or "performance objectives." Such objectives are the basis of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction project on Teaching About the Values of Helping and Caring. For information on this project write to WCCI (see Organizations in the appendix).

These objectives comprise a list of general categories of knowledge about peace problems and some skills to practice in order to engage effectively in the peacemaking process. That process involves transcending the causes of violence and injustice and creating the conditions required for peace and justice.

In planning for learning experiences based on these problem-related objectives, attention must be paid to the conceptual and moral readiness of the children to deal with these problems. Any education based on predetermined sets of concepts must be presented according to the level of understanding of the people involved. It must also take into account the

actual experience of the learners. Concepts such as violence, conflict, injustice, peacekeeping, and interdependence are present realities in the lives of many children. For some, the encounters with violence are mediated through channels like television. Even a cursory examination of the cartoon shows ostensibly designed for children reveals the presence of violence and methods of conflict resolution which are different from those based on the Christian faith.

OBJECTIVE 13: Knowledge of the personal and social costs of violence.

In earlier sessions, two categories of violence were described—the structural or covert violence of unjust social systems, and the institutional or overt violence of armed struggle, particularly warfare. In those sessions, the social costs of such violence were assessed. Information on such costs is necessary in peace education programs. Another important category of costs are those which link people-related objectives to problem-related objectives—providing the bridge between knowledge and values. That bridge is contructed by the personal costs of violence and how violence affects individual human life. It is the physical deprivation and suffering imposed by war and oppression and the frustration of human potential through denial of the fulfillment of needs and talents. Worst of all, it is the distortion of the human personality imposed on both those who suffer the violence and those who perpetrate it. Both perpetrator and victim are dehumanized by violence. This fact should comprise an essential knowledge objective of peace education. For resources on non-violence, write to the Santa Cruz Center for the Study of Non-Violence (see Organizations in appendix).

OBJECTIVE 14: Knowledge of alternatives and a range of dispute settlement and conflict resolution methods.

One of the tragic aspects of the intensely violent social order in which we live is the ignorance of the public regarding alternatives to violence. The public generally accepts war and interpersonal violence as inevitable. "It's always been that way because there is no other way." But it doesn't have to be that way! In fact, it never "had to be that way." A rich literature on nonviolence draws on a wide range of sources from early Christian concepts and practices to Eastern philosophies. A full repertoire of skills, strategies, and formal procedures for nonviolent conflict resolution and even for conducting "nonviolent conflict" now exists. It ranges from institutional procedures such as mediation and arbitration to interpersonal processes such as counseling or effective ways of talking it out. The booklet *Conflict Resolution* is a helpful resource on this topic, as is the Childrens Creative Response to Conflict Project listed in the appendix. Materials which teach about alternatives to violence and teaching methods to develop skills of nonviolent conflict resolution and positive attitudes

toward nonviolence are available from several responsible and experienced peace education organizations. Refer to the booklet in the supplementary packet which lists such organizations, and to the list in the appendix.

It is possible to teach these concepts at all grade levels as they relate to interpersonal experience and to all levels of social organization, from the family through the international system. There is no reason why all learners cannot be provided with this essential knowledge and these fundamental peacemaking skills.

OBJECTIVE 15: Knowledge of various peacekeeping procedures and alternative means of maintaining social order.

Conflict management skills are intended to prevent violence. "Peacekeeping" or "policing" procedures and models are intended to intervene in and halt violence. Most people are familiar with the authentic police model (not the "police state" described in Session Two). The police essentially maintain the domestic tranquility by preventing domestic violence (domestic here means within our own borders) where possible, and halting it where prevention has failed. Police are called upon to intervene in interpersonal violence between citizens and larger scale incidents such as riots.

Such functions are expected and accepted *within* nations, but are very limited as yet *among* nations. However, such was intended to be one of the main functions of the United Nations, and until the advent of the Vietnam War, the U.N. engaged in several important peacekeeping actions. There are various models for alternatives to the procedures for peacekeeping possible under the present U.N. charter. One such model, the "Clark-Sohn Plan," puts forth proposals for staged disarmament. Little or not attention is given to these models in our schools. Most citizens know nothing about them or about such facts as the 1962 "McCloy-Zorin Agreement" between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to work for general and complete disarmament. There are many scenarios and models for warless worlds to be found in science fiction. All of these things are worthy of inclusion in school courses, as are many children's stories and fairy tales which describe some kind of peaceful "Never-Never Land." Unless such models are known, explored, and evaluated, we cannot hope to prepare learners to be real builders of peace, much less believe in its possibility. Articles dealing with teaching about alternative models are available from Network to Educate for World Security (see appendix).

OBJECTIVE 16: Knowledge of the major causes of injustice, violence, and war.

Although the general public is not familiar with it, a significant body of literature exists on the causes of war and injustice. Much of this literature is in the fields of theology and philosophy. Much is in psychology and

geo-politics. Some comes from "peace research." Generally, it has remained in the hands of "scholars" who continue to reflect on it, sometimes write about it, but seldom do anything about it. It is because of this lack of action among scholars and researchers that the knowledge has had little effect. Significant exceptions to this gap between research and action are the field of "participatory research" in which action is part of the inquiry, and the practice of "liberation theology" which calls believers to "do theology" in the world.

Some materials do exist. Opportunities for open inquiry into the fundamental causes of war, and into the phenomenon of war itself, are provided in history courses. Creating the techniques for conducting such inquiry presents an interesting challenge for "peace-minded" teachers. Knowledge of its causes is necessary to find a truly effective cure for any life-threatening disease. The New York City Board of Education has prepared a global history curriculum dealing with general causes of war. The Committee on Peace Research in History also has suggestions. (See appendix).

OBJECTIVE 17: Knowledge of the nature and consequences of planetary interdependence.

A fundamental reason for the fact that a win/lose strategy of interactions with other nations has become a great threat to security is the finite nature of our planet and its life-support systems. The nations of the world are very evidently economically interdependent. The natural systems of the earth are obviously interdependent. Global issues as we have noted are so intimately interrelated that solutions to global problems must be conceived within the paradigm of interrelatedness and interdependence. These concepts have been developed into teaching methods and materials which peace educators refer to as "the systems approach."

The purpose of the systems approach is to instruct in the concepts of interrelatedness and interdependence. It is also intended to prepare learners to think constructively about positive changes in the political and economic systems and structures so as to provide greater possibilities for the achievement of peace and justice. The Center for Global Perspectives, as well as the Network to Educate for World Security, can provide material on this approach (see appendix). Learners need to develop the skills and capacities to enable them to contribute to the *transformation* of global structures from a war system to a peace system. To do this, they need to be familiar with the concept of interdependence and know what systems are and how they operate. Most important, they must come to understand that economic and political systems have been humanly conceived and constructed. Therefore, they can be changed by human beings who have the will and knowledge necessary to do so.

OBJECTIVE 18: Knowledge of basic universal human needs and the various ways of meeting them devised by different cultures and political systems.

Belief in the possibility of changing systems can be nurtured by education about the variety of ways in which cultures of the world perform similar social functions, and the different ways of meeting human needs. Learners must be given a firm grounding in the fact that all human beings are members of a single species which comprises one human family. They should also be given an appreciation of the ingenuity and creativity of the family members in devising different cultures or ways of life. Such appreciation provides a basis for the crosscultural understanding necessary for the achievement of peace. It also assures a wider knowledge of the possibilities for alternative ways for accomplishing the same purpose. A problem which seems unsolvable in one culture may be handled easily in another. While the needs are universal and demand the recognition of the universality of their right to fulfillment, as is stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, there is no "one right way" to achieve their fulfillment. Three useful agencies for resources on teaching about human rights are the Human Rights Internet, UNESCO, and NEWS (see Organizations in appendix).

OBJECTIVE 19: Knowledge of past, present, and proposed future efforts to achieve peace and justice.

The peace movement as part of the human experience has not been given much place in our history texts. Nor do contemporary organized efforts for peace and disarmament receive adequate systematic attention in the schools. If they are considered at all, they are classified as forms of "dissent," with little or no focus on the positive goals and the practical proposals the peace movement has promoted. It is important for learners to know the history of such efforts and the successes and failures they encountered. It is also important for all citizens to have knowledge of and an opportunity to evaluate current proposals for peace and disarmament. The World Conference on Religion and Peace is probably the best single source of information on this topic (see Organizations in appendix).

As we must understand the universality and cultural variety of modes of meeting human needs, so, too, must we learn of past efforts for peace in all parts of the world. As we look at futuristic models for peace and conflict resolution, we should make certain that proposals from all over the world are considered. An historic overview of the peace movement presented from a global perspective should form an important topic in peace education. Sources most useful for achieving this objective are the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association and UNESCO Associated Schools Project (see appendix).

OBJECTIVE 20: Knowledge of major structural changes and changes in values and behaviors which have occurred in human history.

The knowledge required for peacemaking calls for emphasis on the ways human beings have changed the structures which govern their lives and the ways in which they relate to each other. Consideration must also be given to the changes in values and world views which made the structural and behavioral changes possible. We need to ask philosophic and value-based questions as we study history. All students must be provided with some basic understanding of philosophy, which must no longer be reserved for an intellectual elite. Values are the fundamental basis of human relations and social structures. Philosophy should be part of basic citizenship education for all so that all are prepared to work for peace.

Questions to be asked in studying the history of great changes such as the American, French, Russian, and Chinese revolutions, or the abolition of slavery are: What structural or "system" changes took place? How did these changes affect human relations and social processes? How do these changes reflect values different from those of the previous structures? How did these values change? Similar questions can then be asked about the needed and possible changes in contemporary structures and values.

OBJECTIVE 21: Knowledge of persons who have made contributions to peace and justice in all parts of the world.

The history our children study in school is full of tales of heroes. Often these are men who excelled in armed struggle in the liberation or defense of a nation. The list includes a few scientists, inventors, and national leaders. These leaders frequently were military men before their political careers. Such a list teaches nothing of the intense commitment to peace and justice of many who have given their whole "lives and fortunes" to the struggle to transcend violence and serve human needs. The general absence of women demonstrates how little attention history pays to those who model the values of caring, compassion, and concern for suffering and oppression. Florence Nightingale, for example, demonstrated those traits in the midst of a bloody war, but she appears in history only because she was involved in men's endeavors.

Many people quietly and consistently spend their lives in service to others with no expectation of reward other than the fulfillment of their own values and the knowledge that they have made some small difference in the volume and intensity of human suffering. Children and adults need to know about such people. It may be that the transformation to an authentic peace system will result from the accumulation of these "small differences." When caring behavior is not looked upon as "feminine" and appropriate only to one's immediate community, and when caring is respected as a human characteristic to be extended to the entire human family, then peace may be expected. When that happens, security as

it is defined in the first session will be the norm. We can best provide these lessons for children and others by modeling behaviors. Teachers and parents especially should demonstrate these traits in their daily lives. Developing such behaviors is the purpose of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction project on "Teaching about the Values of Helping and Caring" (see appendix for address). We can also provide them with new heroes and heroines—those who have done "heroic deeds" for the sake of true human security. *Peace Be With You*, by Cornelia Lehn (see Additional Resources in appendix), is a book of stories for children about people, both men and women, whose lives demonstrate these qualities.

OBJECTIVE 22: Knowledge of the causes, nature, and consequences of the arms race.

The problem of the arms race is the central dynamic in the processes of militarization. It is the most powerful present obstacle to peace and justice and a dangerous threat to the very survival of humanity. No peace education program is adequate to the task without a significant component on the arms race.

Public ignorance about these issues is as dangerous to human well-being as ignorance of the fundamental principles of sanitation and personal hygiene. We would not think of bringing up our children in ignorance of the principles of sanitation and health. So, too, from the earliest ages, beginning with simple concepts suitable to very young minds, we must teach about this danger. What the participants in this study/action program have learned about the arms race in the earlier sessions should be deepened and restated in various forms suitable to various learning environments. Preparing such learning materials is a task to be undertaken by the educators in your church. A book on disarmament education containing information on this topic is being prepared by the Institute for World Order (see Organizations in appendix).

OBJECTIVE 23: Knowledge of the interrelationships between disarmament, development, and human rights.

This objective was emphasized as a most significant one by the experts gathered at UNESCO's World Conference on Disarmament Education in June, 1980. It poses a challenge similar to that of the previous objective. It requires translating the principles of interrelatedness described in Session Three as they apply to the arms race and human needs into appropriate curriculum materials. Several issues of the *Bulletin of Peace Proposals* contain useful material on this interrelationship (write for a *BPP* index; see Recommended Readings in appendix).

This problem-related objective should also be pursued through materials and learning experiences that relate directly to the way in which the arms race specifically affects the lives of the learners involved and

how it influences their own quality of life as well as that of people in developing countries and poor urban areas of the industrialized world.

OBJECTIVE 24: Knowledge of impediments to disarmament and of possibilities for achieving disarmament.

One of the major problems with citizen participation in stemming the tide of militarization which swells with the increasing pace of the arms race is that most citizens know little or nothing about disarmament. The information is clouded in very technical terms and veiled against public scrutiny by the cover of "national security." It is therefore "left to the experts." who frequently represent the military or are technicians with vested interests in maintaining a high level of armed preparedness. Few experts look at the problems from the perspectives we have outlined in Sessions Two and Three. It is, therefore, essential that the citizenry in general begin to "arm" itself with this information. UNESCO has published a useful volume on this topic, *Obstacles to Disarmament and Ways of Overcoming Them*, edited by Swadesh Rana (see Additional Resources in appendix).

Most important of all, people must learn of the possibilities for achieving disarmament. These possibilities are present not only in terms of alternative system models referred to in Objective 15, but also in terms of opportunities occuring in everyday political interactions and citizens' movements. Our secondary schools should be teaching about contemporary politics as they relate to arms and security issues. Certainly these issues should be treated in all current events courses. Mobilization for Survival is a source of information on this topic. Write to both the national and international units requesting to be placed on their mailing lists (see Organizations in appendix).

An effective way for all citizens, including young people, to learn about such problems and opportunities is to become involved with one or more of the groups working for public education and policy change on security matters (see appendix for information about such groups). All of us should be thinking about the World Disarmament Campaign recommended by a United Nations expert panel. For information about the Campaign, write to the United Nations Disarmament Center (see Organizations in appendix).

Learning through involvement is a most effective pedagogy of both politics and peace.

Recent Stages in the History of Peace Education

These objectives have been derived within the contexts of peace education outlined in Session Four. Those approaches have for the most part been devised over the last decade and a half. Although the origins of peace education are as ancient as the Christian church itself, it is only

in the last century that the subject has been a focus of attention for the systematic efforts of professional educators.

1945-1955

Much of the impetus for peace education came from the experience of two world wars. Since the close of World War II, several significant stages have occurred in the development of peace education. In the decade immediately following the war, peace education focused on the United Nations and how it could promote international cooperation and peace. For a while it appeared that peace education would be synonymous with "education for world citizenship" in a world community which had learned its lesson about the "scourge of war." However, the emergence of the Cold War and the trend toward greater sophistication of weapons of mass destruction, marked by the development of the hydrogen bomb, dramatically changed the backdrop against which education for world citizenship was being developed.

The field of "education for international understanding" split into two separate areas of emphasis: 1) education for international politics as they were influenced and interpreted by the competition between the two superpowers, and 2) education for international cooperation and peace as an approach to the transcendence of the Cold War, an aspect of the "search for lasting peace." This latter emphasis was more related to traditional peace education. It was primarily influenced by the peace movement and is the forerunner of present-day peace education. The history of present-day peace education reflects the stages through which the peace movement has passed in recent decades.

1955-1965

From about 1955 until 1965, peace education activity was very limited. In most areas of the U.S., it was downright unpopular. This was the period during which education "against Communism" dominated the field of international political education. In some cases, those who advocated education for peace were considered to be "unpatriotic." Nonetheless, some significant efforts were made.

The major energies of the peace movement in those years were directed toward the growing dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction and were centered on efforts to "ban the bomb" as a first step toward general and complete disarmament. In fact, the concept of general and complete disarmament was expressed as the goal of the movement. The letters "GCD" were widely used in demonstrations and public information about the nuclear threat. Peace education focused on these same concerns. Independent, sometimes poorly financed, peace education institutes and individual teachers began to develop ways to introduce these issues into adult study groups and into classrooms.

That period of time was one in which film as an educational medium was beginning to work its way into more and more schools and formal education settings. Students in high school, as well as church people and study club members, were discussing the implications of "Dr. Strangelove," "The War Game," and "Hiroshima 1945." This trend resulted in the publication of a useful resource in the field, *The War-Peace Film Guide* (see Additional Resources in appendix).

During this same period of time, the core world order concept of alternatives to the war system was being developed as a teaching device. Simulations which enabled students to work through hypothetical crises under alternative systems were also designed. The mid-60s were a very fruitful period in the development of teaching techniques for problem-centered inquiry and futuristics. Peace education benefitted. The basic teaching theory upon which the booklet *Peacekeeping* (in the packet of Supplementary Resources) was developed resulted from this same inquiry into ways to teach more effectively about alternative futures. Among the groups developing materials of this sort were the Institute for World Order, the World Federalists, and various religious groups.

1965-1975

The signing of the Test Ban Treaty in 1963, and the emergence of the Vietnam War as the single most pressing concern in regard to war and peace issues, brought a new phase to peace education. The major focus of peace education during 1965 through 1975 was on the ethical aspects of war, particularly the justness of war. Interest was renewed in exploration of the just war theory, the individual rights and responsibilities of men in combat, and the humane and inhumane ways of conducting warfare. In the previous period, weaponry and political systems were emphasized in a more abstract way. In this period, the concern was with personal and ethical aspects of warfare as they affected the individual. Personal political choices regarding support for or conduct of the war were central concerns. The peace movement raised questions about these issues in attempts to mobilize the U.S. public to demand an end to the war.

Peace educators raised these questions in study groups and classrooms. Their effort was to help citizens to develop the skills and capacities to make moral choices and engage in moral behavior. At that time, posing such choices and advocating such behavior could involve very real risks of damage to one's social position, employment, or status in a school or university. As in the previous period, peace education was not always welcomed. The war was considered very controversial. It was seen as difficult to analyze. Some asserted that it did not belong in high school classrooms as a subject of study. The potential of such inquiry to turn students away from support of the war was considered unpatriotic. Another

accusation leveled against peace education—and not exclusively in this period—was that the content did not teach students any lessons of lasting value or what has come to be called "the basics." This position has always been refuted by peace educators who believe that a capacity for ethical decision making is one of the fundamental life skills.

Certain other educational innovations caused controversy during this period. Values clarification, which we have identified as essential to peace education, emerged as a teaching method. Teachers felt they needed to help students to come to grips with important personal choices in their social and political lives and in other areas not formerly thought to be of concern to the school. A number of educators began to develop specific procedures to facilitate the students' understanding of what they value and why, as well as how their values could be applied to making personal and political choices. An example of a curriculum resource that reflects the application of these techniques is in the same series as *Peacekeeping*, and is entitled *War Criminals, War Victims* (see Additional Resources in appendix).

The Vietnam War itself was much emphasized as an example of a particular type of colonial warfare or repression of national liberation movements. Peace education became most acutely concerned with the issues of structural injustice and institutional violence. This was noted particularly in the relationships between the industrial nations and the former colonies—the so-called "developing nations." The emergence of "Third World Studies" during these years represented an attempt on the part of educators to provide students and citizens with an understanding of the nature of the indignities and deprivations caused by the continued economic dependence of the developing world on the industrial world. It is widely asserted that this dependency is maintained through exploitative practices by the industrial countries in extracting the natural resources of the developing countries and by conditions of trade which are unfavorable to them. Wars such as Vietnam and other "counter-insurgency" efforts were viewed as neo-colonial wars intended to continue the economic dependence of the former colonies. Such wars were interpreted as attempts to maintain the colonial advantages of the industrial countries. This view of the war as a major instrument of injustice brought forth much of the anti-war protest during the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. The injustice was perceived as so severe, and the war itself so savagely cruel, that little attention was paid to other than these particular ethical issues. Virtually no attention was given to the concept of abolishing the institution of war. Nor was there much consideration of specific policy issues involved in attempting to get the industrial nations to change their basic stance toward the developing world.

The developing world was responding not only with liberation movements and armed struggle for independence and justice, but also by

creating a coordinated strategy to achieve a New International Economic Order (NIEO). The NIEO became a central concept of the peace and justice approach. Also of note was the development approach to peace education. These trends brought a sharp focus to the value of economic equity as a significant basis for a truly secure world community.

A significant development of this period was the document issued by the 1974 session of the General Conference of UNESCO—*The Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation, and Peace and Education Regarding Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. This document is included in the packet of Supplementary Resources. For many years attempts were made to formulate and issue such a statement, but the many differences in the field, including the basic split in education for international understanding noted earlier, frustrated these attempts. However, by 1974, the need was so readily apparent that a statement incorporating virtually all approaches was drafted and adopted. It has since been a major basis for international efforts in the field.

1975 - Present

In 1975, as the Vietnam War was "winding down," the Stockholm Appeal was issued. It focused attention on the severity of the nuclear threat and called for a world disarmament conference to begin the process of achieving general and complete disarmament. Many peace educators once again came to turn their attention to disarmament as a means of achieving the abolition of war. Reversing the arms race and the outlawing of nuclear weapons became rallying cries for this stage of the peace movement. In a way similar to the emergence of coalitions produced by the anti-Vietnam movement, the effort to end the arms race brought together new coalitions of various citizens groups, churches, and professional associations. Those attempting to put an end to the arms race generally focus on the dangers and the cost factors which are described in Sessions Two and Three of this study program. A few are also beginning to pay attention to the concept of alternative security systems as a necessary institutional foundation for the abolition of war. Study methods devised by the world order approach to peace education have emerged again as a way to develop understanding of what will be required to change the present international system based on war to one based on peace.

The disarmament focus of the peace movement has also stimulated a phase of peace education which is now being called "disarmament education." This field was formally recognized by the World Congress on Disarmament Education which UNESCO organized in June, 1980. The Congress was called for by the first United Nations Special Session on Disarmament (SSD-I) which concluded in June, 1978. The final document of SSD-I reflects the UN's recognition of education for peace as a basic

necessity for the achievement of disarmament. UNESCO's World Congress on Disarmament Education brought together peace educators and experts from all over the world. They deliberated for several days and created a final document which outlines some general principles for disarmament education and specific recommendations for their fulfillment. The final document of the UNESCO World Congress on Disarmament is important to those interested in assuring that education makes a significant contribution to disarmament as a fundamental step toward peace and security. The basic principles of the document should be familiar to all concerned with peace education.

> . . . disarmament education should be guided by the following *principles* and *considerations*:
>
> Disarmament education, an essential component of peace education, implies both education about disarmament and education for disarmament. All who engage in education or communication may contribute to disarmament education by being aware and creating an awareness of the factors underlying the production and acquisition of arms, of the social, political, economic, and cultural repercussions of the arms race and of the grave danger for the survival of humanity of the existence and potential use of nuclear weapons.
>
> For the purposes of disarmament education, disarmament may be understood as any form of action aimed at limiting, controlling, or reducing arms, including unilateral disarmament initiatives and, ultimately, general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It may also be understood as a process aimed at transforming the current system of armed nation states into a new world of planned unarmed peace in which war is no longer an instrument of national policy and peoples determine their own future and live in security based on justice and solidarity. . . .
>
> . . . It should recognize fully the relationships disarmament has with achieving international security and realizing development. To be effective in this regard, disarmament education should be related to the lives and concerns of the learners and to the political realities within which disarmament is sought and should provide insights into the political, economic, and social factors on which the security of peoples could be based. . . .
>
> As an approach to international peace and security, disarmament education should take due account of the principles of international law based on the Charter of the United Nations, in particular, the refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States, the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention in domestic affairs and self-

determination of peoples. It should also draw upon the international law of human rights and international humanitarian law applicable in time of armed conflict and consider alternative approaches to security, including such non-military defense systems as non-violent civilian action. The study of United Nations efforts, or confidence-building measures of peacekeeping, of non-violent conflict resolution, and of other means of controlling international violence take on special importance in this regard. Due attention should be accorded in programmes of disarmament education to the right of conscientious objection and the right to refuse to kill. Disarmament education should provide an occasion to explore, without prejudging the issue, the implications for disarmament of the root causes of individual and collective violence and the objective and subjective causes of tensions, crises, disputes, and conflicts which characterize the current national and international structures reflecting factors of inequality of justice.

As an integral part of peace education, disarmament education has essential links with human rights education and development education, in so far as each of the three terms—peace, human rights, and development—must be defined in relation to the other two. Moreover, disarmament education offers an occasion to elucidate emerging concepts such as the individual and collective rights to peace and to development based on the satisfaction of material and non-material human needs.

. . . It aims at teaching *how* to think about disarmament rather than *what* to think about it. It should therefore be problem-centred so as to develop the analytical and critical capacity to examine and evaluate practical steps toward the reduction of arms and the elimination of war as an acceptable international practice.

Disarmament education should be based upon the values of international understanding, tolerance of ideological and cultural diversity, and commitment to social justice and human solidarity. . . .

(Final Document, United Nations SSD-I)

The Next Stage in Peace Education

As the next stages of peace education are considered, attention must be given to such developments as UN Secretary General Waldheim's calling upon the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament to work for the transfer of one-tenth of one percent of what is currently spent on arms into expenditures for the pursuit of peace and the acquisition of knowledge upon which to build peace. Note should also be taken of the significance of UNESCO's World Congress on Disarmament Education. The growing concern over this central issue of the arms race may provide

a productive and comprehensive focus for the next stage in peace education.

The arms race and disarmament are subject areas which comprehend all of the basic problems identified as obstacles to peace. Their resolution calls for some application of all of the approaches to peace education we have described. Thus, the arms race and disarmament provide very fruitful focal topics for a general peace education program. They are also issues around which citizens can mobilize to work for peace. These issues offer a concrete goal which can serve to bring together into one movement all those who hope for the abolition of war and who believe that the abolition of war will require that we educate ourselves in new ways of dealing with conflict and providing security.

The World Disarmament Campaign proposed by a UN expert study group can provide a global banner under which such a movement can be organized. It can also serve as a "launching pad for a major effort in education and research to develop a new technology for peace." Copies of the study group report are available from the UN Centre for Disarmament (see Organizations in appendix). Christian churches can play a significant role in that effort. Perhaps the most constructive contribution they can make is to initiate responsible and comprehensive programs of peace education in their own communities.

For Review, Discussion, and Action

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

1. Go through the people-related objectives to identify and list the basic value which underlies each.

2. Check the problem-related objectives and link each to a problem of peace and justice mentioned in the earlier sessions or in the Supplementary Resources or Recommended Readings.

3. Review the stages of contemporary peace education and note which objectives have appeared to have the highest priority in each stage.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

4. Take the list of values identified under point 1 above and prioritize them according to two criteria: a)your own values, and b)what should be stressed in a peace education in your community.

5. Review the approaches to peace education described in Session Four and designate the values most likely to be communicated by each approach.

6. Take the list of problems identified under point 2 above and determine which approaches are most likely to provide the deepest understanding of each problem and to develop the skills necessary to resolve it.

7. Prioritize the problems in order of urgency using two criteria: a)the value priorities you noted in point 4 above, and b)the likelihood that the problem will increase the probability of war.

8. Decide on the basis of the foregoing what you should emphasize in the peace education program you will initiate. Would others in the community agree with these emphases?

WHAT CAN WE DO?

9. Conduct a community survey to determine what issues are perceived as the most likely to lead to war. This information will be helpful in planning the process of initiating your peace education program.

10. Set up a team to review the television programs, films, magazines, newspapers, books, and other media popular in your community and with your children. Analyze them for value content and problem priorities. Design ways to help parents and community leaders work with children and others to place information from the media within a context of their preferred values and problem priorities.

SESSION 6

STARTING A PEACE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Objective: Introduction of peace education into the schools and other centers of learning in your community.

Contents

- ☐Formulating a Statement of Purpose
- ☐Assessing the Possibilities
- ☐Accumulating Resources
- ☐Establishing Program Goals
- ☐Planning the Innovation Process
- ☐Scheduling the Process
- ☐Evaluating the Results
- ☐For Review, Discussion, and Action

Background Readings

LEVEL I: Resource people and facilitators should read Session Six in this guide and the booklets *Peacekeeping* and *Conflict Resolution*. All other participants should read Session Six in this guide.

LEVEL II: All participants should read Session Six in this guide and the materials specified above for the facilitators. Facilitators should also read the asterisked items in the list of Recommended Readings (see appendix).

LEVEL III: All participants should read Session Six in this guide, the items specified for facilitators in LEVEL I, and the Recommended Readings in the appendix.

Formulating a Statement of Purpose

The determination and articulation of what you hope to accomplish by the peace education program and why is the most fundamental and essential component of the entire process. It will require the group to think through the nature of the problems which call for the establishment of a peace education program. The group will also need to re-examine the assumptions about what causes those problems and clarify their world view and assessment of the trends studied so far. Another need is for clear articulation of what the group has determined to be the causes of the problems, the most effective potential remedies for them, the consequences and changes expected from the remedies, and the learning which will be required to achieve the remedies. A statement of the Christian and democratic values held by your group can serve as the guide to your efforts. On the basis of your assessments and values clarification, write a clear and simple statement of purpose to present to the educational system and to those members of the community concerned with education. Remember, the statement must make clear to others what you believe should be known and understood about war and peace, and why such learning is important.

Assessing the Possibilities

Once your purposes are clearly stated, you need to assess what the actual possibilities are for achieving them within the present reality of your community. First, determine whether the needs, assumptions, assertions, and values which you have clarified and articulated in the statement of purpose are shared by others in your community. Although common concerns may be shared, differences about the ways in which the community and the educational system should respond to the concerns are likely to surface. Differing opinions about education are, indeed, as likely as differences about the means to achieve national security. Clarifying these differences is important. Then you can assess ways in which they affect the possibilities for achieving your purpose, and you can determine how the differences should be taken into consideration in planning your entire process. So, the first task is to assess the community's perception of peace and security issues and what is generally believed to be an appropriate role for education to play in regard to those issues.

A constructive way to initiate the innovation process is to state your purpose in terms which are harmonious with community needs and values. If such is not possible, it will be necessary to find ways to harmonize the differences and communicate to the rest of the community the urgency of the concerns that impelled your group to undertake a peace education program. One way of doing this is to prepare a documented description of how the increased priority on military preparedness affects your community, the ways it uses the community's resources, and the degree to

which the process of militarization has affected the educational system both in curricular and extracurricular activities. The Council of Economic Priorities and the American Friends Service Committee have materials to start your thinking on this topic (see Organizations in appendix).

In some communities, concern might already have been expressed over militarization, military spending, and the over-emphasis on armed force for the maintenance of national security. In such cases, it will be possible for your group to begin to assess the possibilities that exist within educational settings. Include in this assessment what you have already researched about what now takes place in the schools and other learning environments about peace and security issues. Compare the information gleaned from your review of that situation and your statement of purpose.

Your assessment could also include a review of the resources used in the schools, including all classroom materials, texts used for courses, library materials, audiovisual resources, and extra-curricular activities. Another assessment needed is that of teacher openness to the issues and their background preparation for teaching about them.

Try to determine likely places in the curriculum for the introduction of a unit for some formal study of peace and security issues. Identify the most convenient places for innovation in the present curricular sequence. Educators and educational systems respond more positively to innovations which do not require drastic changes in what is currently being taught or in the methods which are being used. We made a case in earlier sessions for some far-reaching changes in content and method. It needs to be remembered, though, that people are most likely to make changes within parameters acceptable to them. The method of innovation should enable them to use familiar resources and techniques they have already mastered. The necessary new information and skills can be added to their professional repertoires at a comfortable enough pace to enable them to become effective peace educators. One very successful approach which incorporates these principles is called the "infusion approach." It requires no significant change in content, but simply calls for the addition of a new line of inquiry to the already existing content. Teachers can be prepared to conduct this inquiry by raising a specific set of questions around existing content in very short workshops. The Justice and Peace Education Council conducts such workshops. Write to them for information and scheduling (see Organizations in appendix).

Assessing the possibilities necessitates a sensitive awareness of community perceptions and values as well as specific knowledge of what is now being taught in the various learning environments in which you hope to carry out this process. Approaching the possibilities positively entails attempts to harmonize concerns and build upon existing programs.

Existing programs that represent sound educational practice may specifically be adapted to peace education.

Accumulating Resources

Three categories of resources are required when undertaking an effective program of peace education: material resources, facilitation resources, and human resources. The human resources are the most significant to your program; the material resources are easiest to assemble.

As you have gone through this study/action program, you have already begun the process of gathering material resources. This guide is one of them. The Supplementary Resources in the Learning Packet may already be part of your resources. If you have collected any of the Recommended Readings listed in the appendix, you have a core of materials that will be useful in your further study and action.

The peace action groups listed in the appendix have materials available. Two which provide bibliographical material are the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy and the Institute for Policy Studies. Both organizations provide names and addresses of other peace-related organizations, as does the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies (see Organizations in appendix).

Ask the Institute for Policy Studies for their *Militarism and Disarmament Catalog* which lists and describes many useful materials. The Coalition distributes an excellent *Disarmament Action Guide: Building National Security* which contains information and action suggestions in the disarmament and security fields. Resource organizations are listed which could help in the process of community education. Their first action suggestion is to "educate yourself and your community."

The peace education movement is a global one. Development of materials and teaching methods is going on all over the world. People in English-speaking countries have produced materials which would be worthwhile reviewing for inclusion in U.S. programs. Some offer suggestions on how to develop programs.

One such useful booklet is *Ideas Into Action*, published by the World Studies Project in England (see Recommended Readings in appendix). It contains concrete suggestions and approaches developed by teachers to instruct about particular issues raised in earlier sessions of this guide. Since the World Studies Project offers a bulk rate in foreign sales to groups, you could use it in teachers' packets for the secondary level.

Ideas Into Action is an example of a facilitation resource. These are resources which help to convince those who must make decisions about peace education that it is necessary to adopt such innovations and that there are readily available, responsible ways to do so. Use of materials from other countries demonstrates the worldwide nature of the peace

education movement. Having such examples of high quality materials is an excellent means of facilitating innovation.

Another facilitation resource are statements of purpose and need in the area of international studies and peace education, which come from authoritative educational institutions or organizations. You may have already collected some of these from your own state and from national agencies. Two such national statements are the 1979 report from the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies and the 1968 report from the U.S. Office of Education on "Needs and Priorities in International Education." Write to the U.S. Office of Education (see Organizations in appendix).

A useful resource for familiarizing yourself with statements from the U.S. and elsewhere is the *World Studies Journal*, Vol. I, No. 4, January, 1981. This issue contains an overview of such statements in an article called "Commitments to Principle: A Review of Professional and Political Statements on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation, and Peace." Two important international statements drafted more recently are not included, but what is in the article provides both a legitimating base for innovation efforts in peace education and evidence that such programs can be carried out without extensive expenditure, retraining or drastic revisions in curriculum. The issue of the *Journal* also contains a number of other statements of principle, a list of resource agencies for disarmament education in Europe, and descriptions of some peace education initiatives in the United Kingdom. Reprints of the article referred to above are available from the Institute for World Order (see Organizations in appendix).

One common aspect of peace education is evident in almost all of the case materials. It is the importance of involving teachers in the planning of the programs and enlisting the support of the educational decision makers. This points up the importance of human resources. The agencies mentioned in the review of material resources and those listed in the appendix are major providers of human resources. So, too, is your own community and educational system a human resource pool for initiating and carrying out your program. Some of these human resources are likely to be in your study/action group. You might want to review the section of Session One which deals with the needed human resources now that you have formulated your purposes and begun your planning.

One way of organizing is to have two working groups which meet regularly to plan, assess, and carry out the peace education program—a community council and a professional advisory committee.

The community council should include representatives of the major elements of the community. People on the council need to have background on peace education and the problems of peacemaking equal at least to

that of your study/action group. Those invited to join the council who have not participated in this learning program could be given some of the materials used in the program. Or, special sessions could be held to provide the needed background for them. The details of both the reading and the possible sessions should be arranged according to what is most appropriate to their interests, perspectives, and experience in relation to the problems of peace and security. An active community council will be evidence of concern and support for peace education among the various elements of the community. Their participation should assure authenticity in basic policy and community action. The members of the council can also serve as peace educators for their colleagues in business, religion, education, health services, or whatever fields they represent.

It would be helpful to have involved in your community council such people as school principals and superintendents, clergy and church leaders, officers of service organizations and active community groups, and the business people of the community, as well as classroom teachers from the systems in which innovations are expected.

A professional advisory committee should include teachers from the various grade levels and people from higher and continuing education institutions and educational resource agencies, if there are any. The committee could include teachers from public, parochial, and private schools. Since it is likely to be a large committee, it can be subdivided to perform particular tasks.

The advisory committee can help to determine which approaches to peace education will be most appropriate in your schools and community. They can consider what materials and teaching methods are most suited to local needs and the conditions of the local schools. They could help to define a general program for each grade level and each learning environment. The committee could implement the program by experimenting with the elements selected for use in your community in their own classrooms and institutions.

Most of the actual work of these two groups will be done separately. However it is important that periodic joint meetings be held so that both groups can address themselves to the total program and to the planning of the innovative process. They should certainly meet together to establish the overall goals of the process.

Establishing Program Goals

You have clarified your purposes, assessed the possibilities, and gotten together a good resource base. Now you should be able to determine what you want to do and what you are capable of accomplishing. A major comprehensive program of peace education in the schools might not be an immediately feasible goal. However, give some consideration to such a goal. From that overall general goal, work toward specific sub-goals.

Determine which of those sub-goals are accessible to you given the resources you have established and the climate in which you will be acting.

Goals could be, for example, the introduction of a certain number of units at specific grade levels, or the introduction of courses, or the preparation of teachers. Goals will be determined by what you want to do, the particular needs of your community, the designated objectives in peace education to be achieved, and the time and resources you have for accomplishing the objectives. A beginning point may be as simple as the introduction of one or two experimental units by one or two teachers already committed to the objectives of peace education and to the values and assertions articulated in your statement of purpose. You may want to start with a more general K-12 program. Consider both the minimum and maximum possibilities before setting definite goals.

Plan your goals in terms of general goals and sub-goals. Try to put them within the context of topical areas, grade levels, and teaching approaches. In the appendix is a sample matrix for curricular goal planning which may be useful. Each group should use whatever goal-setting techniques they find most comfortable and most fitting to their particular situation.

An important thing about goal setting is stating the goals in measurable and concrete terms. Then you will have a clear idea of what kind of progress you are making. Such goals can be easily assessed and evaluated.

Planning the Innovation Process

The process you use to initiate the innovations introduced in your peace education program is a significant factor in your achieving your goals. The planning process involves deciding what will be done by whom, and why a particular step is to be taken by a particular person or group. Think through what messages you want to get to what audiences in your community. Consider who would be the best messenger to deliver it. For example, a teacher might be designated to talk with other teachers in the schools. Members of the community council could build support among their peers in the community. Most important is taking care that those most concerned and most likely to be affected by educational innovations are involved in the innovation process. The methods used for initiating the innovations should be consistent with the democratic values which inspired them.

Community discussion and personal dialogue about a peace education program can be initiated in a variety of ways. These methods vary from individual conversations to public meetings. Plan carefully for large public events. Be sure to gather together enough support among the individuals who will be participating as presenters and audience to assure that a positive atmosphere surrounds the event. Involve enough people who understand the aims of the program so you are not "beginning from scratch" with a large uninformed group. One way of assuring success of

a large meeting is to have those who are convinced and informed invite other people whom they believe would be, or should be, interested. This means that those people who extend such an invitation will be involved in the planning. The educative process begins with personal conversations with the two or three people they invite, prior to the public meeting. They can follow up later with additional discussion of what happened at the meeting.

Regardless of how you begin, think about possible questions that you are likely to encounter about the purposes of the program. Look into reasons for potential opposition and objections. Try to determine the source from which they might come and what concerns, anxieties, and values might be involved. Address these underlying factors as well as the particular sources of opposition. Make every effort to keep communications as positive, open, and constructive as possible. Peace education and security issues can give rise to controversy and conflict. These are not to be avoided, but we need to resolve them so that we may move on to the achievement of the ultimate goal of peace and justice.

The innovation process itself may be a learning experience in constructive resolution of conflicts and for developing the skills of building cooperation among disparate elements of the community. You might want to review the section on "Dealing With Differences" in Session Four to see if those suggestions are useful in transcending such problems in the innovation process. New or alternative procedures might be needed.

The process should include communication and conversation with all concerned. You will need to facilitate the preparation of each sector of the community, helping them to fulfill their responsibilities in the program. This might involve such things as providing principals and superintendents with statements from their professional organizations, librarians and media specialists with lists of resources, teachers with exemplar curriculum materials and opportunities for training, clergy with denominational statements on peace and peacemaking, and so on. Be sure before initiating such communication that you are open to concerns and objections, that you can respond to those concerns, that you can clearly explain why the support and involvement of those with whom you are communicating is important, and that you have practical suggestions for facilitating their involvement.

Scheduling the Process

Planning the process involves setting your sub-goals within the context of a schedule. You know what you want to accomplish, what you need in order to do it, and whom you need to involve. Now schedule a series of events and steps to lead you toward your goal. Since the main goals relate to the schools, consider doing your scheduling on the basis of an academic calendar. A possible calendar might be:

Phase I (Fall term): Conduct a study/action program based on this learning package.

Phase II (Spring term): Conduct a community campaign to gain support and involve relevant sectors of the community in planning a peace education program.

Phase III (Summer): Plan and carry out individual tasks and study assignments to prepare for initiation of the fall program.

Phase IV (Fall): Conduct first experimental teaching units; offer teacher training workshops; hold community meetings.

Phase V (Spring): Apply results of teacher training workshop in as many classrooms as possible. Organize culminating community activity like a Peace Festival or Global Community Celebration involving all sectors of the community.

Phase VI: Prepare for full-scale program.

Phase VII: Launch full-scale program.

Ongoing assessment and revisions should be a permanent part of the program carried out by the Community Council and the Professional Advisory Committee.

Each segment of the calendar should be specifically planned. Plan for some regularity of events and programs. Plan to involve a larger percentage of the community with each additional step or program component. Plan so that each step is directed toward one sub-goal that is well coordinated with the overall goals.

If these guidelines and all the previous components of the innovation process are kept in mind as you proceed, you could have one or two units in classrooms before the end of Phase I, especially if you have teachers in your study group. It may be possible to have one experimental unit in at least one classroom of each grade level before the end of Phase V.

Evaluating the Results

Although it comes last in this description of components of the innovation process, evaluation is *not* a terminal or final step. The entire process is a learning experience. Evaluation is an integral, ongoing part of any effective learning process. In essence, you are learning how to initiate and improve learning about peace and security. It is the aspect of improvement, of continuous learning, which makes evaluation an important part of the process.

The results to be evaluated in this particular process are the outcomes of each step within each phase of the process. An effective evaluation procedure is to ask questions related to the planning process at each step:

What was your specific goal and how was it related to the general long-range goals?

What indicators did you establish to determine your degree of success? According to these indicators, how successful was the step?

Did you choose an effective messenger for the intended audience?

Did you present an appropriate and convincing message?

Does the step need to be repeated?

How can it be more effective?

Should it be abandoned in favor of an alternative step?

What did you learn or accomplish which can contribute to your next step?

You need not answer all these questions. Nor do you necessarily have to use these particular ones. Keep in mind that the purpose of evaluation is not to determine how well something was done so much as what was accomplished and what was learned. Such concerns will help you improve your program and your process.

Remember, evaluation is a prelude to further action. So, too, is this entire study/action program. These six sessions were intended as an aid to action to initiate peace education in your community. The program was prepared so that you and your community might become actors in the peacemaking process. In such action can be found the most promising possibilities for authentic security.

For Review, Discussion, and Action

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

1. Review the components of the innovation process to determine if your group will be able to undertake all of them. Is it necessary to implement each component in your community?

2. List the fundamental values, assumptions, and assertions you want to include in your statement of purpose.

3. Make a list of the factors in your community which are favorable to peace education and another list of obstacles and objections.

4. Collect all the listings of relevant curriculum and resource materials now in your schools which you have gathered during the earlier sessions.

5. List the people who might be invited to join the Community Council and those who might serve on the Professional Advisory Committee.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

6. Discuss the *Final Document of the World Congress on Disarmament Education*, taking into consideration the following points:

—the relation of the principles (Section A) to the priorities you placed on the learning objectives outlined in Session Five.

—the relation of the first eight points to the list of values, assumptions, and assertions you drafted as the basis of your statement of purpose and to the problems described in Session Three.

—the possibilities for carrying out the principles in the schools of your community as indicated by the lists of factors drafted in response to point 3 above and in the curriculum material gathered under point 4 above.

7. How does the content of *Peacekeeping* relate to the issues and problems raised in the first three sessions of this study/action program? Are these issues suitable content for peace education at the secondary school level? If not, on what content would you want to base a secondary level program? Are the values outlined in *Peacekeeping* in harmony with your group's values? What do you want your children to learn about world order values? How do your responses here relate to the values you listed under point 2 above?

8. What learning objectives listed in Session Five might be achieved through use of the booklet, *Conflict Resolution*? At what age and within what contexts would you want your children to learn about conflict and conflict resolution? What attitudes toward conflict should the schools try to develop? How might knowledge about conflict and conflict resolution be useful in your innovation process?

9. How do you think student learning in peace education should be evaluated? How do your ideas relate to present evaluation practices in the schools? How should the group evaluate the learning gleaned from participation in this study/action program?

WHAT CAN WE DO?

10. Appoint a subcommittee to draft a statement of purpose on the basis of the list drafted under point 2 above. The entire group should then review, amend, and adopt the statement. The committee might have to meet again for redrafting prior to adoption.

11. Prepare a set of responses and strategies for dealing with the obstacles and objections you listed under point 3 above. Play devil's advocate to "rehearse" them. Revise and sharpen them and plan opportunities for actually engaging in such discussions.

NOTE: *Completing points 12 and 13 may require another group session.*

12. Appoint group members to meet with the potential members of the Council and Advisory Committee. Provide these potential members with background materials. Meet with them again to determine the level of interest in the program. Give each your statement of purpose.

13. Plan a tentative schedule and set of goals for the next two phases of the process. When the group has agreed, circulate the tentative proposal to all the people contacted under point 12 above.

14. Call a meeting of your group and all the people consulted under points 12 and 13 above. The purpose of this meeting is to decide upon the innovation process, to make plans for developing the program, and to schedule and launch the introduction of a peace education program into your community.

Please send a copy of your proposed program and reports of its progress to:

United Ministries in Education
c/o Educational Ministries – ABC
Valley Forge, PA 19481

Appendix

RECOMMENDED READINGS

Those resources having an asterisk are recommended for LEVEL II study. All resources are recommended for LEVEL III study.

SESSION TWO

Gerald and Patricia Mische, *Toward a Human World Order*, Paulist Press, New York, 1977.

*Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1980*, WMSE Publications, Leesburg, VA. Available for the years 1976-1981.

World Order Models Project Working Papers, a series of pamphlets published by the Institute for World Order, 777 U.N. Plaza, New York, 10017.

*Gernot Kohler, "Global Apartheid"

Rajni Kothari, "Toward a Just World"

SESSION THREE

*Ruth Leger Sivard, *World Military and Social Expenditures 1980*. See especially page 35 and the pull-out section on the destructive force of nuclear weapons, and "The Nuclear World of 1980."

World Order Models Project Working Papers

Richard Falk, "Nuclear Policy and World Order: Why Denuclearization"

*Richard Falk, "A World Order Perspective on Authoritarian Tendencies

*Robert Johansen, "Salt II: Illusion and Reality"

Robert Johansen, "Jimmy Carter's National Security Policy: A World Order Critique"

Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 1979, No. 4, Peace Research Institute of Oslo, 4 Radhugst, Oslo, Norway.

SESSION FOUR

George Henderson, ed., *Peace Education: Focus on Mankind*, 1973 Yearbook, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, DC 20002.

Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 1980, No. 2., Peace Research Institute of Oslo, 4 Radhugst, Oslo, Norway

*Peace Education Kit, COPRED, Center for Peaceful Change, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242.

SESSION FIVE

*James and Kathleen McGinnis, *Educating for Peace and Justice*, 1981, four volumes, Institute for Peace and Justice, 2913 Locust Ave., St. Louis, MO 63103. Volumes II and IV are especially useful for the objectives of this session.

Ideas Into Action—A handbook for Teachers by Teachers, 1981, World Studies Project, c/o One World Trust, 24 Palace Chambers, Bridge St., London SW1A 2Jt, England.

Peace and World Order Study Guide, 1981, Institute for World Order, 777 U.N. Plaza, New York, NY 10017.

Bulletin of Peace Proposals, 1980, No. 3, Peace Research Institute of Oslo, 4 Radhugst, Oslo, Norway.

SESSION SIX

James and Kathleen McGinnis, *Educating for Peace and Justice*, Volumes III and IV.

The UNESCO Courier, September, 1980. Available from UNIPUB, 345 Park Avenue South, New York, NY 10010.

World Studies Journal, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1981. Available from Groby College, Ratbe Road, Leicestershire, England.

Report from the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies. Available from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.

*Where Are We Now? a compendium of statements on international global education by national educational organizations, prepared by H. Thomas Collins for Global Perspectives in Education, Inc., 218 East 18th St., New York, NY 10013.

"Education in a Global Age," a staff development working paper prepared by the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 475 Riverside Drive, New York, NY 10115, ATTN: Esther Stine.

Teachers Resource Manual on World Mindedness, an annotated bibliography of curriculum materials (K-12), by Ida Urso. Available from the Curriculum Inquiry Center, Graduate School of Education, 334 Moore Hall, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

Guidelines on global education from your state department of education.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

"Beyond the Cold War," *Crises in World Order Series*, Lawrence Metcalf, ed., 1974, Random House. Available from COPRED (see Organizations).

Conclusions Drawn from a Survey on Perceptions of Military Preparedness, 1980. Available from United Ministries in Education (see Organizations).

Discrimination: The Cycle of Injustice, Betty Reardon, Holt-Saunders Pty. Ltd., 1977. Available from COPRED (see Organizations).

Denominational and Religious Statements on Peace, Disarmament, the Arms Race, and Militarism. Available from UME Liaison Office, Church of the Brethren, 1451 Dundee Ave., Elgin, IL 60120.

"Militarism and Sexism: Influences on Education for War," Betty Reardon, *Connexion*, Fall, 1981. Available from United Ministries in Education (see Organizations).

Obstacles to Disarmament, Swadesh Rana, ed., UNESCO, 1981. Available from UNIPUB (see Organizations).

Peace Be With You—Stories of Peace Heroes for Children, Cornelia Lehn, Faith and Life Press, Newton, Kansas.

"The Struggle for Human Rights," *Perspectives in World Order Series*, Jack Fraenkel, ed., Random House, 1974. Available from COPRED (see Organizations).

"War Criminals, War Victims," *Crises in World Order Series*, Lawrence Metcalf, ed., Random House, 1974. Available from COPRED (see Organizations).

World Studies Journal, Vol. II, No. 3, 1980. Available from Groby College, Ratbe Road, Leicestershire, England.

War-Peace Film Guide, available from World Without War Publications, 67 E. Madison, Suite 1417, Chicago, IL 60603.

PEACE RESOURCE AND SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

American Friends Service Committee
1501 Cherry St., Philadelphia, PA 19102. Tel. 215-241-7000.

Arms Control Association
11 Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.
Tel. 202-797-6450.

Bread for the World
32 Union Square East, New York, NY 10003. Tel. 212-260-7000.

Catholic Peace Fellowship
339 Lafayette St., New York, NY 10012. Tel. 212-673-8990.

Center for Defense Information
600 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, DC 20002.
Tel. 202-484-9490.

Center for Peace and Conflict Studies
754 Grosberg Religious Center, Wayne State University,
Detroit, MI 48202. Tel. 313-577-3454.

Center for Peaceful Change
Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242. Tel. 216-672-3143.

Center for Peace Studies
University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325. Tel. 216-375-7008.

Center for Theology and Public Policy
4400 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20016.
Tel. 202-363-3088.

Childrens Creative Response to Conflict
c/o Fellowship of Reconciliation, P.O. Box 271, Nyack, NY
10960. Tel. 914-358-4601.

Clergy and Laity Concerned
198 Broadway, New York, NY 10015. Tel. 212-964-6730.

Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy
120 Maryland Ave., N.E., Washington, DC 20002.
Tel. 202-546-8400.

Consortium on Peace Research and Education (COPRED)
Center for Peaceful Change, Kent State University, Kent, OH
44242. Tel. 216-672-3143.

Council on Economic Priorities
84 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10011. Tel. 212-691-8550.

Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Wisconsin Ave. and Woodley Rd., N.W., Washington, DC
20016. Tel. 202-363-5532.

Fordham University Center for Education for Justice and Peace
Room 217, Lincoln Center, New York, NY 10023.
Tel. 212-757-7516.

Global Development Studies Institute
P.O. Box 522, 14 Main St., Madison, NJ 07940.

Global Education Associates
552 Park Ave., East Orange, NJ 07017. Tel. 201-675-1409.

Global Learning
40 South Fullerton Ave., Montclair, NJ 07042. Tel. 201-783-7616.

Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.
218 E. 18th St., New York, NY 10003. Tel. 212-228-2470.

Global Education Project
c/o Institute for World Order, 777 U.N. Plaza, New York, NY 10017. 212-490-0010.

Human Rights Internet
1502 Ogden St., N.W., Washington, DC 20011.
Tel. 202-462-4320

Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies
251 Harvard St., Brookline, MA 02146. Tel. 617-734-4216.

Institute for Global Education
25 Sheldon, S.E., Grand Rapids, MI 49503. Tel. 616-454-1642.

Institute for Policy Studies
1901 Que Street, Washington, DC 20009. Tel. 202-234-9382.

Institute for Peace and Justice
2913 Locust Ave., St. Louis, MO 63103. Tel. 314-533-4445.

Institute for World Order
777 U.N. Plaza, New York, NY 10017. Tel. 212-490-0010.

Interfaith Center to Reverse the Arms Race
c/o All Saints Church, 132 N. Euclid Ave., Pasadena, CA 91101.
Tel. 213-449-9430.

International Peace Bureau
Rue de Zurich 41, CH-1201 Geneva, Switzerland.
Tel. 022-316429.

International Peace Research Association—Peace Education Commission
c/o Robert Aspeslagh, 1132 Hobbe Mahade, 1072 XV Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Jane Addams Peace Association
1213 Race St., Philadelphia, PA 19107.

Jewish Peace Fellowship
Box 271, Nyack, NY 10960. Tel. 914-358-4601.

Justice and Peace Education Council
20 Washington Square North, New York, NY 10011.
Tel. 212-475-6677.

Mobilization for Survival
135 W. Fourth St., New York, NY 10012. Tel. 212-834-1118.

Mobilization for Survival Religious Task Force
85 S. Oxford St., Brooklyn, NY 11217. Tel. 212-858-6882.

Network
806 Rhode Island Ave., N.E., Washington, DC 20018.
Tel. 202-526-4070

New York City Board of Education
131 Livingston St., Brooklyn, NY 11201. Tel. 212-596-6273.

Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign
251 Harvard St., Brookline, MA 02146. Tel. 617-734-4216.

Peace Link
c/o Cambridge Institute for Societal Learning, P.O. Box 30, Cambridge, MA 02238.

Plowshares
321 Chapel, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 7Z2.
Tel. 613-236-4547

Resource Center for Creative Nonviolence
P.O. Box 2324, Santa Cruz, CA 95063. Tel. 408-423-1626.

Riverside Church Disarmament Program
490 Riverside Drive, Rm. 544, New York, NY 10027.
Tel. 212-222-5900.

Shalom Educational Project
67 E. Madison, Suite 1417, Chicago, IL 60603.
Tel. 312-236-7459.

United Ministries in Education
c/o Educational Ministries—ABC, Valley Forge, PA 19481.
Tel. 215-768-2052.

U.N. Centre for Disarmament
Room 35776, United Nations, New York, NY 10017.
Tel. 212-754-5313.

UNESCO
7 Place de Fontenoy, Paris, 75700.
Also United Nations, New York, NY 10017.

UNESCO - Associated Schools Project
c/o Dr. Ward Morehouse, 777 U.N. Plaza, New York, NY 10017.
Tel. 212-754-5974.

UNIPUB
345 Park Avenue South, New York, NY 10010. Tel. 212-686-4707.

U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20002.
Tel. 202-655-4000.

World Conference on Religion and Peace
777 U.N. Plaza, New York, NY 10017. Tel. 212-687-2163.

World Council for Curriculum and Instruction
P.O. Box 171, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027. Tel. 212-678-3972.

World Education Center
c/o World Without War Council, 1730 Grove St., Berkeley, CA 94709. Tel. 415-845-1992.

World Without War Council
175 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10010. Tel. 212-674-2085.

This list was prepared by Sam Totten, UME Peacemaking Interne, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1981-1982.